THE SHEMSU HOR HYPOTHESIS

A Continuation: What Egypt Remembered

Zep Tepi Series, The Corridor — Paper III
Sefy Levy | 2026 | DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19449606 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Abstract

> *"Nor has one ever seen it in the annals of the predecessors since the Followers of Horus."* — Thutmose I, Tombos Stele, l. 15 (Urk. IV, 82–87; trans. after Sethe)

Paper III is the Egyptian record. Paper I (Levy 2026a) established the Richat Structure as the sole surviving candidate Saharan origin site, set within the Mauritanian prehistoric sequence (Vernet 1993, 1996), by eliminating twenty of the twenty-one formations it tested against four criteria: scale sufficient to support a population, documented Holocene water, human presence in that window, and a central elevation rising from that water. Paper II (Levy 2026b) documented genomic endpoints at both corridor termini and a Canopus gradient encoded in the Wedjat.

Egypt preserved its own answer: the Shemsu Hor, the Followers of Horus. They hold a non-optional slot in Egyptian king-list architecture across fifteen centuries of independent sources — Turin Royal Canon, Pyramid Texts, state inscriptions, temple-building traditions — not generic legitimation figures. Later pharaohs cite their written annals; Ptolemaic builders at Dendera cite a leather roll of their time containing architectural plans. The Palermo Stone, centuries older, sets predynastic rulers of Lower Egypt before the dynastic sequence and carries the Shemsu Hor festival in every second year-cell — read by Hertz (1931) as an incipient era. Of the traditions surveyed — Sumerian, Babylonian, Hittite, Vedic and Chinese — only the Shemsu Hor are invoked in scribal accountability contexts as custodians of recoverable archives.

Four primary lines of evidence are documented: the textual tradition establishing that slot (Ryholt 2004; Gardiner 1959); the elite cemetery at Hierakonpolis, where four Saharan pastoral markers appear together at HK6 and a fifth, cranial, line at site level; a survey of some 350 temples in which thirteen, from Sudan to the Delta and Siwa, lie within 1.1° of Canopus's declination at their dates, an orientation family spanning about 2,000 years whose meaning its authors regard as unexplained; and three independent chronologies converging on 3800–3100 BCE, whose lower bound rests on the Bayesian radiocarbon model for the First Dynasty (Dee et al. 2013). The Edfu Building Texts (Reymond 1960; Kurth 1998) corroborate rather than supply primary evidence.

Six independent fields — paleohydrology, genetics, archaeology, archaeoastronomy, textual criticism and climate chronology — converge on the corridor migration model: the most parsimonious available explanation rather than a demonstration; the skeletal evidence is consistent with population movement without establishing it. Decisive tests remain, all on existing collections: isotopic and aDNA analysis of Predynastic elite contexts, geochemical sourcing of Naqada II hard-stone vessels against the Richat carbonatite signature (Sedigh et al. 2024), and A-Group aDNA.

Keywords: Shemsu Hor; Followers of Horus; Predynastic Egypt; Egyptian state formation; African Humid Period; Green Sahara; Zep Tepi; Eye of Horus; Wedjat; Canopus; Osiris; ancient DNA; A-Group Nubia; Hierakonpolis; HK6; Takarkori; Nuwayrat; Turin Royal Canon; Pyramid Texts; temple orientations; archaeoastronomy; Saharan corridor hypothesis

Author's Note

What I have done here is assemble what has already been published—transliterations, translations, footnotes, structural observations—and asked whether those texts, read carefully, are consistent with the corridor migration documented in Papers I and II.

No AI generated this argument. The AIs helped me find, verify, and structure sources. The interpretive framework and editorial judgments are my own.

The pattern that emerged surprised me. The Shemsu Hor are not generic legitimation figures. Later pharaohs cite their written annals. Ptolemaic builders cite a leather roll from their time containing architectural plans. This archival specificity is without clear parallel among the other ancient king-list traditions surveyed here.

The linkage of the Canopus gradient to the still-unexplained Belmonte Canopus orientation family, the numerical correspondence between Belmonte's rotations and the Wedjat fractions, the resulting seven-family hierarchy, and the conditional Richat–Wedjat geometric model are my own original syntheses.

Introduction: Three Papers, One Argument

We have been walking.

Paper I followed the water. The Green Sahara, green for ten thousand years, then turning to sand. The Kufra river system, documented by satellite radar beneath the dunes, with tributaries from the Tibesti, Uweinat and Gilf Kebir (Paillou et al. 2009). Not a single continuous highway but a stepping-stone highland corridor — Tassili n'Ajjer, Tadrart Acacus / Takarkori, Messak Settafet, Gilf Kebir — where plateau springs and wadi seepage sustained movement as the lowland basins dried; the Kufra channels, Neogene rather than Holocene and draining north to the Mediterranean, cross the same eastern ground without serving as a route to the Nile. The place they left: the Richat Structure, concentric rings of blue-gray stone, flood-fed wadi deposits dated to the Green Sahara, the only formation in the Sahara that satisfies every criterion the texts describe. Twenty others failed there, and seven more tested in Paper II failed too: twenty-eight evaluated, twenty-seven eliminated.

One remained. ***The Eye of the Sahara.***

Paper II followed the people. Their DNA, traced from Taforalt in Morocco (15,000 BP) through the eastern Maghreb to Takarkori in the Fezzan (7,000 BP) to the Nuwayrat genome in Old Kingdom Egypt (2855–2570 BCE). Their cattle, buried under stone tumuli at Nabta Playa (Wendorf and Schild 2001), sacrificed by the thousands at Kerma. Their symbols: the ring within a ring set in stone on the Messak, the cattle skulls laid before the kings of Kerma, the Wedjat written in Egypt. Their star: Canopus — lower with every degree of latitude gained, falling steeply on the last move north (from about 7° at Hierakonpolis around 3700 BCE to 3.6° at Memphis in 3100 BCE), below the horizon at Giza until about 4630 BCE and, though above the horizon from about 4630 BCE, effectively lost there as a usable reference through the Predynastic period (3.6° at 3100 BCE; detectable on a clear night, lost on dust and haze nights); at roughly 4.5° altitude by pyramid-building time, still low, faint and reddened, at the latitude where they built their greatest temple to Osiris.

The walk from Zep Tepi – People of the First Time.

Now we are at the end. The Nile. The place where they settled, built, wrote, ruled. And there is a question Paper II did not ask—a question Egypt itself asked, every time a king took the throne, every time a priest opened a scroll, every time a builder laid a foundation stone:

Who came before us?

The Egyptians had an answer. They gave it a name. They wrote it down. They carved it into temple walls and copied it into royal lists for fifteen centuries.

They called them the **Shemsu Hor**. The Followers of Horus.
This is Paper III. It asks what Egypt itself remembered.

Chronological conventions. Absolute dates in this paper follow Shaw (2000) unless stated. For the First Dynasty the series follows the Bayesian radiocarbon chronology of Dee et al. (2013), which places the foundation of the state (the accession of Aha, 3218–3035 BCE at 95%) earlier than Shaw's historical scheme; this applies to the c. 3100 BCE start of the First Dynasty and Den's accession at c. 2925 BCE used in the papers. For the Naqada phases the papers quote dates from excavation reports (for example HK6, Naqada IC–IIB, c. 3800–3600 BCE); Dee et al. date the Naqada IB/IC transition to about 3650 BCE, IIB/IIC to about 3450 BCE and IID/IIIA to about 3325 BCE, so the earliest of these conventional dates may be up to about 150 years too old. The African Humid Period is taken as c. 14,800–5,500 cal BP; some sources give a start nearer 14,500.

PART I: THE SKY THEY CARRIED

We walked north. We watched the star sink.

That is not metaphor. It is physics.

Canopus—the second-brightest star in the night sky—has an epoch-dependent visibility limit: at 5500 BCE the star was only visible from locations south of 27.7°N; precession gradually lifted this limit northward, reaching approximately 33.5°N by 3100 BCE and 34.5°N by pyramid-building time (~2570 BCE). For every degree of northward latitude, its maximum altitude drops by approximately 1°. Any population that moved northeast from the western Sahara toward the Nile met it lower at every step north—a navigational marker, a seasonal clock—though over the centuries of the journey precession lifted it by about 0.23° each century, so that the star fell sharply only on the last move north, from Hierakonpolis to Memphis.

At the Richat Structure (21.1°N), Canopus stood at 6.6° in 5500 BCE and 10.4° by 4000 BCE. At Nabta Playa (22.5°N), lower. At Hierakonpolis (25.1°N), low but visible. At Giza (30°N) during pyramid-building time (~2570 BCE) it stood at roughly 4.5° — horizon-grazing, faint, reddened and effectively lost as a usable reference (detectable on a clear night, lost on dust and haze nights).

This is not a theological claim. It is observable astronomy. The gradient is real. The direction is fixed. Any population that walked this route experienced it.

Now look at what they built.

Part I documents what the corridor populations carried in the sky: the Canopus gradient they lived under, the Wedjat sky-schema that encodes it, and the two-thousand-year record of what that astronomical tradition built in stone, as far as the survey's published tables show it. The evidence in this Part is presented in three tiers, each independently verifiable.

Tier 1 (Section 1): The Canopus visibility gradient and the Shaltout/Belmonte temple orientation surveys. These are independent of any assumption about the corridor's source site. The gradient is observable physics—Canopus descends approximately 1° per degree of northward latitude. The survey data is a peer-reviewed documented record: about 350 temples and seven families of orientation, of which the Canopus family comprises thirteen temples within 1.1° of Canopus's declination at their dates in the published tables, with its full cultural significance left open by the survey authors. These lines stand whether or not the Richat is the correct origin and whether or not the Wedjat correspondence holds.

Tier 2 (Sections 1–2): The Wedjat as Transmission Architecture. The Wedjat is a generalized system for encoding threshold-crossing under conditions of irreversible loss. A corridor migration is precisely such a condition. The full argument is in 'The Wedjat as Transmission Architecture' (Section 1). The Wedjat argument is not counted among the six evidence lines used for consilience; it addresses mechanism, not occurrence.

Tier 3 (Section 1): The Canopus–Osiris identification. Conditional, minority scholarly position, carries no independent evidential weight. Full analysis in 'An Additional Layer: The Canopus–Osiris Scholarly Identification' (Section 1). The empirical case in this Part rests entirely on Layers 1 and 2.

1. The Canopus Gradient: An Observable Astronomical Reality

Before presenting the evidence, a note on how this section is organized. The material falls into four tiers, distinguished by their evidentiary status:

Tier	Definition	Sections
Tier 1: Established Fact	Peer-reviewed, verifiable, accepted in the literature. Does not depend on any assumption about the corridor or the Richat.	Canopus gradient; Belmonte rotations as documented; temple orientation surveys)
Tier 2: Verifiable Correspondence	Numerical matches in published sources, not previously noted in the literature. Generates testable predictions. Not presented as independent evidence for migration.	1/2, 1/4, 1/8 = Belmonte's documented rotations; Wedjat hierarchy → Predictions 6a–6c)
Tier 3: Conditional Observation	Depends on Paper I's Richat candidate surviving Prediction 7 (geochemical sourcing). If that candidate is falsified, this observation dissolves.	Geometric calculation from Richat to Hierakonpolis
Tier 4: Scholarly Identification (Minority Position)	Not required for the main argument. Noted as conditional additional convergence, not as evidence.	Canopus–Osiris identification

[Tier 1]

Canopus (α Carinae) is the second-brightest star in the night sky. Its visibility is physically constrained by latitude and precession. At 5500 BCE — the peak of the Green Sahara occupation — the star could not be seen from locations north of approximately 27.7°N. For every 1° of northward latitude, its maximum altitude drops by approximately 1°. Any population that moved northeast from the western Sahara toward the Nile during this epoch would have found it lower at every step north — a

navigational and seasonal marker whose altitude fell by about 1° for each degree of latitude gained, partly offset by precession over the centuries of the journey, so that the sharp fall comes on the last move north, from Hierakonpolis to Memphis.

The Shaltout/Belmonte surveys document a Canopus orientation family (nearly twenty of some 350 Egyptian temples; thirteen within 1.1° of Canopus's declination in the published tables), found from Sudan to the Delta and Siwa and densest in Upper Egypt; the authors read the main peak as pointing to the Late Period. The survey authors document this family and identify it with the star Canopus, but its cultural significance remains genuinely open: they offer only a tentative identification with the "Great Star" (sbA aA) of the Pyramid Texts and explicitly call for the question to be studied in depth in the future (Shaltout, Belmonte & Fekri 2007: 156). No settled explanation for the family has been established in the archaeoastronomical literature. The corridor hypothesis provides one possible mechanism: the tradition was formed where the star was prominent, carried north with the populations who held it, and encoded in sacred architecture; this mechanism has not been tested against the survey. No theological identification is required for it to hold.

Along the proposed migration route from the western Sahara to the Nile Valley, this gradient at 5500 BCE is directly observable:

Location	Latitude	Canopus Altitude (5500 BCE)
Richat Structure (Mauritania)	21.1°N	~6.6°
Nabta Playa	22.5°N	~5.2°
Hierakonpolis	25.1°N	~2.6°
Luxor / Thebes	25.7°N	~2.0°
Canopus visibility limit	27.7°N	0°
Giza	30.0°N	Below horizon

The total latitude difference between the Richat Structure (21.1°N) and Giza (30°N) is 8.9°. At 5500 BCE, this gradient meant that Canopus — a bright navigational star at the origin — was already below the horizon at the destination. As precession moved the star northward over subsequent millennia, Canopus gradually became visible at Giza, reaching approximately 4.5° altitude by the time of pyramid construction (~2570 BCE). A tradition formed in the southern Sahara during the Green Sahara peak would have met the star lower at every step north and, on the last move north to the Memphite region, effectively lost as a usable reference; its descendants, generations later, would have inherited institutional memory of a star that had once been prominent and was now low and marginal.

A specific geographic alternative requires direct engagement. The claim that the Canopus tradition could have originated in Upper Egypt — at Luxor or Aswan — and spread north, without any western Saharan migration, is not excluded by the gradient evidence alone. At Luxor (25.7°N), Canopus stood at approximately 7° altitude in the Predynastic period (using epoch-appropriate calculations), low but easily detectable on a clear night (Schaefer 1998). Nabta Playa, located in the Egyptian western desert at 22.5°N, provides documented evidence. Malville et al. (2008) explicitly note that at Nabta in 4500 BCE, Canopus reached a maximum altitude of approximately 8° above the southern horizon — and observe that, with the exception of Canopus, the megalithic alignments at Nabta appear to correspond to the brightest stars in the night sky. The second-brightest star in the sky was conspicuously absent from the Nabta megalithic alignment programme despite being visible, the

reason is not known; the survey's own Canopus-family temples stand where the star was about 6–10° high, so low altitude alone does not explain the omission. At 21.1°N — the latitude of the Richat Structure — Canopus stood higher still. The gradient therefore neither excludes nor requires an Upper Egyptian origin, and the question is left open. Prediction 6c, which would have addressed it, is not supported by the survey papers read so far (see the status of Predictions 6a–6c).

These are not independent lines but coherent expressions of a single astronomical-cultural system. Their strength lies in internal consistency across domains, not statistical independence.

How the Cardinal Families Are Built: The Construction Protocol

[Tier 1 / Tier 2]

The seven orientation families documented by the Shaltout/Belmonte surveys fall into three groups by the survey authors' own classification (Belmonte 2011: 80; Shaltout, Belmonte and Fekri 2007: 156). Two families (II and III) are solar. Two (IV and V) correspond to the two brightest stars in the Egyptian sky, Sirius and Canopus. Three families — I (equinoctial/eastern), VI (meridian/northern), and VII (quarter-cardinal/diagonal) — form what Belmonte explicitly terms a "cardinal super-family," accounting for the majority of temples in the dataset.

The cardinal super-family has a documented construction method. A primary north–south axis was first established through stellar observation of Meskhetyu — the Bull's Foreleg asterism, the Egyptian name for the Plough — sighting circumpolar stars to identify true north. That axis was then rotated to produce the three cardinal orientations. The three rotations Belmonte documents are:

* One-half of a circumference (180°): due north or south — the meridian family (VI)
* One-quarter of a circumference (90°): due east — the equinoctial family (I)
* One-eighth of a circumference (45°): the NE/NW diagonal — the quarter-cardinal family (VII)

[Tier 1] These values are Belmonte's own stated practical construction steps, documented in peer-reviewed publications. They describe how the dominant category of Egyptian temples was oriented across 2,000 years of construction history and 350+ surveyed sites.

[Tier 2] They are also the first three fractions of the Wedjat binary system: 1/2, 1/4, 1/8.

This correspondence has not previously been noted in either the archaeoastronomical or Egyptological literature. No publication connects Belmonte's rotation fractions to the Wedjat sequence. This numerical match is verifiable in published sources on both sides. 'The Wedjat as Transmission Architecture' (Section 1) documents the Wedjat system across its attested domains; 'The Seven Families and the Wedjat Hierarchy' (Section 2) applies the full seven-fraction hierarchy to the orientation dataset and to the Canopus anomaly.

The Wedjat as Transmission Architecture

The Wedjat is treated here in two strictly separated roles: first, as a cognitive-preservation framework describing how partial knowledge can be structured and transmitted over time; second, as a hypothesis-generating tool used to generate testable expectations about patterns that would be expected if such a system were historically operative.

Conditional Status: The material in this section uses the Richat Structure coordinates (21.1°N) because Paper I identified the Richat as the sole surviving candidate after systematic elimination of twenty alternative Green Sahara formations (twenty-one formations analyzed in Paper I, twenty eliminated; twenty-eight across Papers I and II, twenty-seven eliminated). This material is conditional on Paper I's candidate surviving Prediction 7 (geochemical sourcing). If Prediction 7 falsifies the Richat candidate, the correspondence dissolves entirely.

The Wedjat framework addresses a different question: how continuity could be maintained across such a migration. It is therefore not counted among the six primary evidence lines used for consilience.

Established Evidence: The Wedjat as a Documented Cognitive System

[Tier 1]

The Wedjat binary fraction series — 1/2, 1/4, 1/8, 1/16, 1/32, 1/64 — is attested across every major domain of Egyptian knowledge without dispute:

- **Grain administration:** The hekat measurement system of the Rhind Mathematical Papyrus uses the binary series as its foundational structure (Gillings 1972; Clagett 1999). Ritter (2002) analyses the rise and eventual abandonment of these ‘Horus-eye’ capacity fractions in the hieratic record, establishing 1/64 as the lower bound of the series below which scribes adopted ro notation instead.

- **Pharmaceutical dosing:** The Ebers Papyrus employs the same binary fractions for measuring ingredients, with a secondary system extending to 1/128 for smaller units (Pommerening 2003).

- **Lunar timekeeping:** The 15-day filling of the eye from new moon to full moon structured lunar festivals; the Coffin Texts identify Thoth as "who protects and fills the Eye of Horus in the Day of new moon" (Parker 1950; Eaton 2013; Faulkner 1973–78).

- **Funerary protection:** Book of the Dead Chapter 140 prescribes the placement of wedjat amulets on the mummy; Chapter 167 equates the restored eye with the deceased's revitalization.

- **The Opening of the Mouth ritual:** An adze shaped like the wedjat eye was used to ritually open the mouth, eyes, and ears of the mummy, restoring the senses lost at death (Otto 1960; Roth 1993).

- **Temple offerings:** Edfu Temple hosted a formally named Wedjat presentation ritual (the *Hnk WDAt*), part of the widespread Egyptian tradition in which the Eye of Horus served as the archetypal offering (Sugi 2005).

Across all these domains, the Wedjat performs the same cognitive work: it **quantizes a continuous domain** (grain volume, pharmaceutical dose, lunar time, sensory perception), **marks a threshold** (between life and death, profane and sacred, visible and hidden), and **encodes the restoration of what was lost** (the eye healed, the dead revived, the senses restored).

The six fractions sum to 63/64. The missing 1/64 is acknowledged in Egyptian sources as requiring the magic of Thoth to complete the whole. Thoth's domain is writing, transmission, and the substitution of encoded knowledge for the thing itself. The 1/64 is not a mathematical error. It is a structural acknowledgment that some component of any whole cannot be physically recovered — and must therefore be preserved through externalized encoding.

Model-Based Inference: The Wedjat as a Framework for Threshold Crossing

[Tier 2 — Interpretation generating predictions]

A population executing a corridor migration faces exactly the problem the Wedjat is built to solve. The following can be carried north: ritual practice, iconography, astronomical observation systems, oral tradition, material culture. The following cannot be carried north: the ground itself, the specific latitude, the particular altitude at which Canopus stood above the origin's southern horizon. That specific sky is the 1/64. No human effort recovers it. It can only be preserved through Thoth's mechanism — written record, institutional memory, architectural encoding of where the star last appeared.

The argument here is not that the Wedjat was designed for migration. It is that the Wedjat is a generalized architecture for threshold-crossing under conditions of irreversible loss — and a corridor migration is precisely such a condition. A culture already in possession of this cognitive tool would deploy it at the moment it was most needed.

This framework generates a specific behavioral prediction. If the Wedjat logic governed how this culture preserved what could not be physically carried, we would expect them to preferentially encode irrecoverable elements through externalized records rather than symbolic substitution. We would expect findable archives, not cosmic myth. We would expect named physical documents in professional accountability contexts, not impossible reign lengths. Section 4 documents whether this prediction holds.

Geometric Observation (Conditional)

[Tier 3 — Conditional on Paper I's Richat candidate]

One geometric observation follows from the corridor's dimensions and is noted for completeness. Applied to the corridor from the Richat Structure (21.1167°N) to Giza (29.98°N), the 1/2 fraction — the primary threshold, the largest recoverable piece — falls at 25.55°N. This corresponds to within 70 km of the Upper Egyptian primary settlement zone: Hierakonpolis (25.1°N), El Kab (25.15°N), Luxor

(25.7°N), Edfu (24.98°N). The remaining five fractions produce no named correspondences and are not claimed to.

This single observation is conditional on Prediction 7a: if the Richat candidate is falsified by geochemical sourcing, the corridor calculation dissolves and is withdrawn. It is presented as a conditional observation consistent with the corridor model, not as independent evidence.

Separately: the Canopus visibility limit (27.7°N) falls at 74% of the corridor distance — a constraint of stellar mechanics, not of the Wedjat, and noted independently.

Testable Prediction — Uniqueness of the Richat Structure as the Wedjat Origin

[Tier 2/3 — Model-Based Prediction Conditional on Paper I]

The synthesis of the Wedjat binary fraction system, Belmonte's documented temple orientation rotations, and the Canopus visibility gradient generates one unified, falsifiable prediction.

Derivation order: The six conditions below are first derived from the established properties of the Wedjat binary series, Belmonte's rotation families, Canopus declination physics, and the documented northeast migration corridor. Only then is the Richat Structure tested against this pre-defined set.

If the Wedjat encodes a structured transmission of knowledge from a southern/western concentric-ring origin along the northeast migration corridor to Giza — with the binary fractions representing quantized stages of loss and the missing 1/64 the irrecoverable portion supplied by Thoth's externalized memory (writing) — then applying the 1/64 fraction to the latitude difference between the origin and Giza must satisfy six independent conditions:

1. **Geometric placement.** The resulting point lies inside a prominent natural concentric-ring geological dome, providing visual and symbolic resonance with the layered "eye" form of the Wedjat.

2. **Directional orientation.** The point falls in the mid-to-outer ring zone on the northeast-facing side of the structure, aligned with the documented ancient migration corridor to the Nile Valley.

3. **Canopus visibility.** Canopus is visible from the origin at 5500 BCE (though low on the southern horizon), while below the horizon at Giza at the same epoch.

4. **Chronological occupation.** The site shows evidence of human activity during the Green Sahara window (c. 6500–4500 BCE).

5. **Corridor alignment.** The directional bearing from the 1/64 point aligns with the documented northeast highland corridor — the stepping-stone refugia network of plateau and massif sites (Tassili, Takarkori, Messak, Gilf Kebir) that Paper I identifies as the primary migration route, with the Kufra paleochannels as supplementary paleohydrological features (Drake et al. 2011;

Klokočník et al. 2017; Paillou et al. 2012). PALSAR L-band radar mapping of the Kufrah River traced its headwaters to the Gilf Kebir plateau — Node 5 of the Highland Corridor — and identified the system as a likely corridor for fauna and human dispersal in the eastern Sahara (Paillou et al. 2009).

6. **Symbolic consistency.** The placement is consistent with the missing 1/64 as the piece that cannot be recovered by direct observation alone — preserved only through institutional memory (the Shemsu Hor / Followers of Horus).

Calculation using exact centers

Richat Structure center: 21.1167°N (Abdeina et al. 2024; USGS/NASA consensus)
Great Pyramid apex (Giza): 29.97917°N

Latitude difference: 8.86247°
1/64 of this difference = 0.138476°

Using the standard Earth meridian length of 111.32 km per degree of latitude:
0.138476° × 111.32 km/° ≈ 15.415 km north of Richat center.

This point lies well inside the Richat's documented ~40 km diameter (outer radius ~20 km), within the mid-to-outer concentric ring zone on the northeast sector oriented toward the Nile corridor. Canopus was low but visible from this latitude in 5500 BCE, and was below the horizon at Giza at that same epoch.

Archaeological surveys document predominantly Acheulean lithics, with scattered, low-density Neolithic surface finds along wadis in the outer annular depressions. No published evidence exists of sustained pastoralist camps or cattle-related activity comparable to Takarkori or Nabta Playa; the material is consistent with intermittent human presence during the Green Sahara period rather than intensive habitation (Giresse et al. 2012; Sao et al. 2008). The bearing from this point to Giza aligns with the documented northeast highland corridor.

Numerical correspondence between Belmonte's rotations and the Wedjat fractions: The three rotations Belmonte documents for the cardinal super-family — 180° (half turn), 90° (quarter turn), and 45° (eighth turn) — correspond exactly to the Wedjat's first three binary fractions (1/2, 1/4, 1/8) of a full turn; the survey's rotations also include 135° (family VII has both 45° and 135° peaks), which equals the sum of two Wedjat fractions (1/4 + 1/8 of the circle). This correspondence has not previously been noted in the archaeoastronomical or Egyptological literature. It is a numerical observation in published sources; it generated expectations about orientation frequency (Predictions 6a–6c), which are tested below.

Uniqueness claim

Among known concentric-ring geological features and Green Sahara occupation sites, the Richat Structure currently appears to be the only location satisfying the full set of six independent conditions.

No other candidate combines the precise 1/64 geometric placement inside the rings, directional alignment, Canopus visibility gradient, chronological occupation evidence (however intermittent), corridor bearing, and symbolic "irrecoverable piece" constraints.

Falsification criteria

This prediction is directly testable and can be falsified by:

- A systematic global survey of known concentric-ring structures and Green Sahara sites demonstrating that any alternative candidate satisfies all six conditions; or
- Higher-resolution geological or satellite mapping, or targeted excavation, demonstrating that the 1/64 point falls outside the Richat's main concentric system, lacks northeast-side orientation, or shows no occupation evidence in the 6500–4500 BCE window.

If either occurs, the specific Richat–Wedjat geometric-astronomical model is falsified. Confirmation of the full set at Richat (and absence elsewhere) would provide strong support for the hypothesis that the Wedjat encodes a structured memory of a southern/western origin transmitted northeast along the migration corridor, carried by the Shemsu Hor, and possibly echoed in the still-unexplained Canopus orientation family documented by Belmonte's surveys (a link this paper has not been able to test).

Derivation statement

This prediction is derived solely from established spherical astronomy (Canopus declination vs. latitude), the documented Wedjat binary fractions, Belmonte's archaeoastronomical surveys (including the authors documenting the Canopus family while leaving its full cultural significance open), publicly available geological and satellite data (Abdeina et al. 2024), paleoclimate and occupation records (Kuper and Kröpelin 2006; Giresse et al. 2012), paleohydrological corridor data (Drake et al. 2011; Paillou et al. 2009), and the Shemsu Hor textual tradition. It does not rely on any unverified acoustic, electromagnetic, or golden-ratio interpretations.

An Additional Layer: The Canopus–Osiris Scholarly Identification

[Tier 4 — Minority scholarly position, conditional additional convergence, not evidence]

Status: The physical case established in Sections 1–2 does not depend on what follows. This subsection is presented as conditional additional convergence, not as evidence. The dominant Egyptological tradition places Osiris's stellar form with Orion (Sah); the Canopus identification is a minority scholarly position.

The Canopus–Osiris identification has a scholarly history independent of this paper. Allen (1899) first observed the connection between Canopus and Osiris's celestial ship. Lockyer (1894) documented early Egyptian temple orientations toward Canopus and noted the star's association with Osiris as god of the Nile. Lockyer is cited here for priority of observation only: Belmonte (2001, n. 41) records that The Dawn of Astronomy was criticised by Egyptologists of its own time for numerous historical errors and mythological speculation, and no evidential weight is placed on it here. The city of Canopus in the

Nile Delta was a pre-Ptolemaic centre of Osirian cult worship: throughout the existence of the grand temple of Amun-Gereb in Thonis-Heracleion, Osiris was taken by ritual barque to his sanctuary in Canopus in an annual procession, and Osiris was worshipped there under the form of a human-headed vessel — the origin of the Egyptological term "canopic jars" (Goddio 2006). The city named after the star was an Osirian cult centre before the Ptolemaic period. This is independent archaeological grounding that does not pass through any single scholar's argument.

Priskin's contribution is systematic peer-reviewed analysis of the astronomical evidence from primary sources. Across a series of publications in *Égypte Nilotique et Méditerranéenne*, he builds the Canopus–Osiris case from systematic analysis of the Dendera zodiacs as narratives of the Osiris myth (ENiM 8, 2015), the astral myth of Osiris in the decans of Taurus and Libra (ENiM 9, 2016), and the constellations of the Egyptian astronomical diagrams (ENiM 12, 2019). His 2019 paper specifically describes Canopus as appearing "hovering low down in the southern parts of the sky, as if just in front of the prow" of Osiris's celestial ship, citing Plutarch's own identification of the ship with Osiris — a connection first noted by Allen (1899) and Lockyer (1894).

If the identification holds: the Pyramid Texts record that the Shemsu Hor followed Osiris in this world before passing after him into the Other World (Allen 2005; Faulkner 1969). That is a textual statement about the Shemsu Hor's cultic relationship to Osiris that stands without any stellar identification. If Priskin's identification is correct, it acquires a second literal meaning: the Shemsu Hor followed the star northward, where it stood lower at the end of the journey. A population that followed Canopus northward and then built two thousand years of sacred architecture oriented to where the star stood would leave exactly the orientation pattern the surveys document (the temple list in Section 2); the survey authors themselves say they cannot yet connect it to Egyptian religion. The identification, if confirmed, makes the textual and physical records say the same thing. Until it is confirmed, the physical records stand alone.

Osiris is also titled *Khenti-Amentiu* — Foremost of the Westerners — in the Pyramid Texts (Allen 2005). The conventional funerary reading places Osiris at the head of the dead. If the Shemsu Hor came from the west, a complementary reading is available: Osiris was literally foremost among the peoples of the western Sahara. Both readings are compatible.

2. The Temple Orientation Evidence: A Modest, Contested Pattern

The Egyptian–Spanish Mission measured about 350 temples, roughly 95% of those surviving in any state of preservation (Belmonte et al. 2010), and found in the histogram of their declinations seven families of orientation (Shaltout and Belmonte 2005; Shaltout, Belmonte and Fekri 2007; Belmonte, Shaltout and Fekri 2008). Family V lies at the declination of Canopus. Belmonte, Pérez Die and Díaz-Iglesias Llanos (2016) place nearly twenty temples in it.

What the survey authors say about it. “We cannot prove the importance of Canopus for the ancient Egyptians, notwithstanding the fact that it was their second brightest star in the sky” (Shaltout, Belmonte and Fekri 2007, Part I); the more significant of the two peaks “could suggest a major interest in Canopus in the Late Period”, but “we do not know how to justify this from the religious, economical or social point of view” (ibid.). In the overview they add: “we do have minor doubts as to whether many of the presumed alignments to Canopus should be interpreted in a different way”, and they reassign the neighbouring peak V+ to a different rule, “II perpendicular”, saying that peak “has nothing to do

with Canopus" (Belmonte, Shaltout and Fekri 2008: 201–202). The same wording appears in Belmonte and Shaltout (2010: 537).

What the data show. In the 2008 histograms the Canopus peak is modest, about 1.3 times the average level (read from the figure) and the weakest of the labelled families. It is present for Upper Egypt (including Middle Egypt and Lower Nubia) and for the oases and deserts. It is not present as a peak in the 2008 histogram for Lower Egypt alone (about 70 temples), but a Canopus peak (peak 7) appears in the 2007 Lower Egypt and Siwa sample, with members at Mendes, Tanis and Siwa (Shaltout, Belmonte and Fekri 2007). In Sudan, 55 temples give six significant peaks (winter solstice, Sirius, two meridian peaks, equinoctial and inter-cardinal) and none as a peak at the declination of Canopus, although one temple, Mut at Gebel Barkal (25th Dynasty), lies at it (Belmonte et al. 2010, Section 2.1, Figure 7 and Table 2). The 2008 analysis finds no Canopus orientations in the Old or Middle Kingdom and describes the family as "lacking in the earliest periods". Individual temples stand close to Canopus's declination at their dates: Karnak (the axis of pylons VII and VIII, "perhaps deliberately orientated to Canopus"; Belmonte, Shaltout and Fekri 2008), the Heryshef temple at Herakleopolis Magna and Qsar al-Sagha (Middle Kingdom, both "possible"; Belmonte et al. 2010, 2016), Philae (the temple of Isis) and Armant (the mammisi). At Siwa the authors present Canopus as one of two alternatives and "do not feel able to favour one hypothesis over the other" (Shaltout, Belmonte and Fekri 2007, Part II).

What this paper does and does not claim. The survey is not evidence of a Saharan origin for the family, and it is not offered here as one. This paper does not claim that the family tracks precession statistically: its thirteen members span about 1840 BCE to AD 100, but tracking has not been tested (the survey authors suggest one possible case: the Heryshef temple at Herakleopolis Magna, c. 1850 BCE, and the chapel of its Third Intermediate Period necropolis, c. 800 BCE, whose orientations fit the setting of Canopus at the two dates; Belmonte, Pérez Die and Díaz-Iglesias Llanos 2016), and the frequency of members does not fall steadily with the star's altitude (below). Earlier versions of this paper built period-by-period and region-by-region tables on named temples. Checked against the surveys' own declination tables, counting both senses of each axis as the survey authors do (Shaltout, Belmonte and Fekri 2007, Figure 9), the regional counts largely hold, but several named temples did not match (Tod, Es Sebua, Dendera, Edfu, Esna, Kom Ombo, Kalabsha, Dakka, Qertasi, Soniyat); the Oracle of Amun at Siwa lies 3.1° from Canopus by calculation but is counted by the survey authors as a possible Canopus case (Belmonte, Pérez Die and Díaz-Iglesias Llanos 2016); the corrected tables below replace the earlier ones, and the list at the end of this section gives the temples that do match. What can be said is that a Canopus orientation family exists from Sudan to the Delta and Siwa, densest in Upper Egypt, that the survey authors regard its meaning as an open question, and that testing it against this series' hypotheses requires the temple-by-temple list in Belmonte, Shaltout and Fekri (2009), Appendix II, which this paper has not yet used.

Temporal Analysis: Canopus-Compatible Temples across Two Thousand Years

Temples whose declination, in either sense of the axis, lies within 2° of Canopus's declination at the temple's date, grouped by period (declinations from the survey tables; Canopus's declination and altitude computed with the series script, Part 1; dates are dynasty mid-points).

Period	Canopus Altitude at Giza (30°N)	Northern Sites	Southern Sites (25°N)	Evidentiary Status
Middle Kingdom (c. 1840 BCE)	~5.6°	Qsar al-Sagha, 12th Dynasty (29.6°N, ~6.0°; −55¼°, 0.9° from Canopus); Herakleopolis, Heryshef temple (possible, Belmonte et al. 2016)	None within 1.1° in the tables read (Tod, −46.9°, does not match)	1 firm, 1 possible
New Kingdom (c. 1450–1100 BCE)	~6.1°	None within 1.1° (the 22nd-Dynasty Tanis temple below is the nearest northern case)	Karnak: Montu (18th), Sethy II (19th), Ramesses III (20th), Khonsu (20th–21st); Armant, Montu (18th). Borderline: Karnak, Raet-tawy	5 within 1.1°, 1 borderline
Third Intermediate Period (c. 900 BCE)	~6.8°	Tanis, Horus of Sile, 22nd Dynasty (30.8°N, ~5.9°; −55¼°, 2.0° from Canopus); Herakleopolis, chapel of the Third Intermediate Period necropolis (possible, Belmonte et al. 2016)	—	1 borderline, 1 possible
Late Period (c. 700–350 BCE)	~7.0°	Mendes, Naos of Shu (26th; 31.0°N, ~6.0°; axis reversed, 0.8°). Borderline: Tanis, Khonsu (30th; axis reversed, 1.4°)	Gebel Barkal, Mut (25th; 18.5°N, ~18°; 0.1°); Karnak, Osiris (30th; axis reversed, 0.8°)	3 within 1.1°, 1 borderline
Ptolemaic and Roman (c. 250 BCE–AD 100)	~7.3°	Siwa: Zeitun stone temple (axis reversed, 0.2°), Khamisa (0.4°; date	Philae, Isis (0.7°); Armant, Mammisi (0.4°). Borderline: El Kab, Nekhbet speos (1.6°)	4 within 1.1°, 1 borderline

Period	Canopus Altitude at Giza (30°N)	Northern Sites	Southern Sites (25°N)	Evidentiary Status
		uncertain)		

Geographic Analysis: Where the Family Stands

Region	Latitude / Canopus altitude at the members' dates	Documented Canopus Temples
Sudan	18.5°N / ~18°	1: Gebel Barkal, Mut (25th Dynasty). Soniyat does not match (3.6°)
Upper Egypt and Lower Nubia	24.0–25.7°N / ~10–13°	8: Karnak ×5, Armant ×2, Philae. Borderline: El Kab, Karnak (Raet-tawy)
Siwa Oasis	29.2°N / ~8°	2: Zeitun stone temple, Khamisa. The Oracle of Amon (3.1° off by calculation) is counted by the survey authors as a possible case (Belmonte et al. 2016)
Middle Egypt	29.6°N / ~6°	1: Qsar al-Sagha (plus Herakleopolis, possible, Belmonte et al. 2016)
Lower Egypt (Delta)	30.8–31.0°N / ~6°	1: Mendes. Borderline: Tanis (Horus of Sile, Khonsu)
Giza and the Memphite necropolis (Old Kingdom)	30°N / ~4.5°	None: the pyramid temples lie on the meridian
Total	—	13 within 1.1° of Canopus's declination at their dates; 4 borderline (1.1°–2.0°)

Altitude and frequency. Members stand from about 18° (Sudan) to about 6° (the Delta and Middle Egypt), and none stands lower than 5.9°. Their frequency does not fall steadily with the star's altitude: in the survey samples (Belmonte, Shaltout and Fekri 2008; Belmonte et al. 2010) it is about 1 of 55 temples in Sudan, about 8 of 165 in Upper Egypt, about 2 of 95 in the oases and 1 to 3 of 70 in Lower Egypt, so Prediction 6b is not supported while Prediction 6c is supported only in part. Counts are indicative: they use the temples listed at the end of this section, not the survey authors' own temple-by-temple list (Belmonte, Shaltout and Fekri 2009, Appendix II), which this paper has not yet seen.

The Wedjat's Geographic Reach

Paper II proposed that the Wedjat's distribution traces the migration and then the state expansion. No Wedjat is reported from the A-Group royal cemetery at Qustul (Williams 1986), so an early Nubian attestation of the symbol remains to be established. The state expansion phase is documented separately: Levant appearances after 3100 BCE, Phoenician maritime network from ca. 800 BCE, local Punic manufacture without Levantine population movement (Ringbauer et al. 2025); for the corpus of Egyptian amulets recovered from Palestine/Israel see Herrmann (1994). A 2024 discovery of a Wedjat amulet in a Late Pre-Islamic tomb at Dibbā al-Bayah in the Sultanate of Oman documents

the symbol's reach via long-distance trade networks after state consolidation, testifying to the "international nature of trades linked to the port of Dibbā" (Tursi and Genchi 2024).

The Punic and Omani cases illustrate a mechanism central to this series: culture migrates independently of genes. A symbol can travel with people who no longer understand its full meaning and still perform its original function. This is the mechanism the corridor hypothesis proposes for Saharan symbolic vocabulary entering dynastic Egypt through gradual demographic integration rather than conquest.

"The examples are not offered as evidence for the migration window itself, but as illustrations of the post-state mechanism by which the Wedjat — and by extension, Saharan symbolic vocabulary — propagated through trade networks and persisted across millennia."

The Wedjat as a Cognitive System: Threshold Quantization Across Domains

The Wedjat is not a single-purpose symbol. Its binary fractions (1/2 through 1/64) are documented across every major domain of Egyptian cognition:

- **Grain administration:** The hekat measurement system of the Rhind Mathematical Papyrus uses the binary series as its foundational structure (Gillings 1972; Clagett 1999).

- **Pharmaceutical dosing:** The Ebers Papyrus employs the same binary fractions for measuring ingredients, with a secondary system extending to 1/128 for smaller units (Pommerening 2003).

- **Funerary protection:** Book of the Dead Chapter 140 prescribes the placement of wedjat amulets on the mummy; Chapter 167 equates the restored eye with the deceased's revitalization (Quirke 2013; Faulkner 1985).

- **The Opening of the Mouth ritual:** An adze shaped like the wedjat eye was used to ritually open the mouth, eyes, and ears of the mummy, restoring the senses lost at death (Otto 1960; Roth 1993).

- **Lunar timekeeping:** The 15-day filling of the eye from new moon to full moon structured lunar festivals; the Coffin Texts identify Thoth as "who protects and fills the Eye of Horus in the Day of new moon" (Parker 1950; Eaton 2013; Faulkner 1973–78).

- **Temple offerings:** Edfu Temple hosted a formally named Wedjat presentation ritual (the *Hnk WDAt* — see ‘Temple Archives and the Leather-Roll Medium’, Section 8), part of the tradition in which the Eye of Horus served as the archetypal offering (Sugi 2005).

In each application, the Wedjat performs the same cognitive work: it **quantizes a continuous domain** (grain volume, pharmaceutical dose, lunar time, sensory perception), **marks a threshold** (between life and death, profane and sacred, visible and hidden), and **encodes the restoration of what was lost** (the eye healed, the dead revived, the senses restored).

This is the documented pattern of use across the Egyptian record. The Wedjat was not a single-purpose amulet. It was a system — a structured cognitive tool for managing transitions across every domain of Egyptian knowledge.

The Seven Families and the Wedjat Hierarchy

The seven orientation families documented by the surveys, arranged in order of knowledge accessibility, are matched, as an interpretation offered in this paper, to the seven components of the Wedjat binary system. The first three fractions match Belmonte's documented construction rotations exactly, and the fourth documented rotation (135°) is the sum of two of them. The remaining four map to increasing levels of knowledge required to produce each orientation tradition.

Wedjat	Belmonte Family	Construction Rotation	Knowledge Required
1/2	VI — Meridian/Northern	180° (half turn)	Pure geometry: rotate N–S axis by half turn
1/4	I — Equinoctial/Eastern	90° (quarter turn)	Pure geometry: perpendicular to established axis
1/8	VII — Quarter-Cardinal	45° (eighth turn)	Pure geometry: 45° rotation of established axis
1/16	II — Solstitial	—	Solar observation: sun at extreme positions, requires years of watching
1/32	III — Seasonal	—	Solar observation: Egyptian calendar markers, requires multi-year tradition
1/64	IV — Sirius	—	Transmissional: identification of a specific star and its significance, requires generational instruction
Missing	V — Canopus	—	Irrecoverable at northern latitudes: preserved only through institutional memory of a sky that can no longer be seen

The three largest fractions — 1/2, 1/4, 1/8 — generate orientations any builder can produce through pure geometry from a single observed north–south line. No astronomical observation beyond finding north is required. They are immediately and always recoverable on-site. The middle fractions — 1/16, 1/32 — require solar observation sustained across seasons and years: recoverable, but not immediately, requiring time and a watching tradition. The smallest fraction — 1/64 — maps to Sirius: not discoverable by geometry or patience alone, requiring transmitted knowledge of which star matters and why.

The assignments of the first three fractions are exact: a half-turn, a quarter-turn and an eighth-turn of the circle (180°, 90°, 45°) correspond to families VI, I and VII. The survey's rotations also include 135° (family VII has both a 45° and a 135° peak; Belmonte, Shaltout and Fekri 2008), which equals the sum of two Wedjat fractions (1/4 + 1/8 of the circle). The assignment of 1/16, 1/32 and 1/64 to the solstitial, seasonal and Sirius families, and of the “missing” piece to Canopus, is an interpretation offered in this paper; it is not a finding of the surveys, and it depends on there being exactly seven families, a count the survey authors themselves revise (2008). Canopus at about 4.5° altitude over Giza at 2570 BCE is faint but detectable on a clear night (apparent magnitude about 2.1 in clean air; Schaefer 1998), so it had not left the sky, but it had receded, at that latitude, to the edge of usability: it stood lower than at

any Canopus-family temple the survey names (about 6° or higher), too low for a shaft, and dust and haze could hide it altogether. The family persists at the northern limit of its range, where the star stood only about 6° high (Mendes, Tanis, Qsar al-Sagha), and no member stands lower than 5.9°.

Status of this hierarchy: The hierarchy proposed here is an interpretation, not an established finding. It generated three specific predictions; tested against the survey papers as far as they have been read, 6b and 6c are not supported and 6a cannot yet be judged.

- **Prediction 6a:** The cardinal super-family (Families I, VI, VII) should be the most frequent orientation group in the dataset, the solar families less frequent, and the stellar families least frequent — decreasing accessibility predicts decreasing frequency. Result: cannot yet be judged; the 2008 histogram peak heights are broadly in this order but are not frequencies, and counts need the temple-by-temple list (Belmonte, Shaltout and Fekri 2009, Appendix II).

- **Prediction 6b:** Canopus orientation frequency should decline continuously and proportionally to the star's altitude at each latitude, not as a binary present/absent threshold. Result: not supported; the Sudanese temples, where the star stood highest, show no Canopus peak (Belmonte et al. 2010), Lower Egypt shows none, and the family appears in the oases and deserts.

- **Prediction 6c (the hardest test):** Canopus-oriented temples exist in the dataset at sites and periods where Canopus was genuinely non-observable — below practical naked-eye altitude — indicating transmitted institutional memory rather than direct observation. Result: partly supported; Canopus-family temples persist at the northern limit of the family's range, where the star stood only about 6° high (Mendes, Tanis, Qsar al-Sagha; none lower than 5.9°), but that altitude is still detectable on a clear night, so the survey does not show the family at sites where the star was wholly non-observable.

Prediction 6a remains testable against the published temple-by-temple list without new fieldwork.

The Shaltout/Belmonte surveys and the Wedjat system were produced independently, in different millennia, by different methodological traditions. Their correspondence is exact for the first three fractions and, for the fourth rotation, a sum of two; the remaining assignments are this paper's interpretation. The Edfu Building Texts — analyzed in Section 8 — independently describe this same system from the inside: what the surveys measure from the outside, the texts record from the inside. The relationship between those two bodies of evidence is the subject of Section 8.

The Canopus-Compatible Temples, Temple by Temple

The following table lists the temples in the Shaltout/Belmonte survey series (Papers 1, 3 and 5 of that series) whose declination, in either sense of the axis, lies within 2° of Canopus's declination at the temple's date, computed with the series script (Part 1); a difference above about 1.1° is marked borderline. Temples listed in earlier versions whose declinations in the survey tables are far from Canopus (Tod, Es Sebua, Dendera, Edfu, Esna, Kom Ombo, Kalabsha, Dakka, Qertasi, the Oracle of Amon at Siwa and Soniyat) have been removed; the four Old Kingdom rows are negative results.

#	Temple / Location	Latitude / Canopus Altitude	Epoch / Period	Orientation Status / Source
OLD KINGDOM (c. 2686–2181 BCE)				
1	Giza, Pyramids	30°N / ~4.5°	4th Dynasty	No Canopus orientation / Paper 3
2	Abusir, Pyramids	29.9°N / ~4.8°	5th Dynasty	No Canopus orientation / Paper 3
3	Saqqara, Pyramids	29.9°N / ~4.8°	3rd–6th Dyn	No Canopus orientation / Paper 3
4	Dahshur, Pyramids	29.8°N / ~4.7°	4th Dynasty	No Canopus orientation / Paper 3
MIDDLE KINGDOM (c. 2055–1650 BCE)				
5	Qsar al-Sagha	29.6°N / ~6.0°	12th Dynasty (c. 1840 BCE)	−55¼° (direct), 0.9° from Canopus; within 1.1° / Belmonte et al. 2010, Table 1
6	Herakleopolis Magna, Heryshef temple	29.1°N / ~6.5°	Middle Kingdom (c. 1850 BCE)	Possible Canopus orientation / Belmonte et al. 2016
7	Herakleopolis Magna, chapel of the Third Intermediate Period necropolis	29.1°N / ~7.7°	Third Intermediate Period (c. 800 BCE)	Orientation fits the setting of Canopus c. 800 BCE (a diachronic shift consistent with precession, from the temple of c. 1850 BCE); possible / Belmonte et al. 2016
NEW KINGDOM (c. 1550–1077 BCE)				
8	Karnak, Montu precinct	25.7°N / ~10.4°	18th Dynasty (c. 1450 BCE)	+53.0° (axis reversed), 0.9°; within 1.1° / Shaltout & Belmonte 2005, Table 1
9	Armant, Montu	25.6°N / ~10.5°	18th Dynasty (c. 1450 BCE)	−52.8° (direct), 1.1°; within 1.1° / Shaltout & Belmonte 2005, Table 1
10	Karnak, Sethy II	25.7°N / ~10.7°	19th Dynasty (c. 1200 BCE)	−54.5° (direct), 0.9°; within 1.1° / Shaltout & Belmonte 2005, Table 1
11	Karnak, Ramesses III	25.7°N / ~10.8°	20th Dynasty (c. 1150 BCE)	+53.3° (axis reversed), 0.2°; within 1.1° / Shaltout & Belmonte 2005, Table 1
12	Karnak, Khonsu	25.7°N / ~10.8°	20th–21st	−52.7° (direct), 0.8°;

#	Temple / Location	Latitude / Canopus Altitude	Epoch / Period	Orientation Status / Source
			Dynasty (c. 1100 BCE)	within 1.1° / Shaltout & Belmonte 2005, Table 1
13	Karnak, Raet-tawy	25.7°N / ~10.4°	18th Dynasty (c. 1450 BCE)	+52.3° (axis reversed), 1.6°; borderline / Shaltout & Belmonte 2005, Table 1
THIRD INTERMEDIATE AND LATE PERIOD (c. 945 –332 BCE)				
14	Tanis, Horus of Sile	30.8°N / ~5.9°	22nd Dynasty (c. 900 BCE)	−55¼° (direct), 2.0°; borderline / Shaltout, Belmonte & Fekri 2007, Table 1
15	Gebel Barkal, Mut (B300)	18.5°N / ~18.4°	25th Dynasty (c. 700 BCE)	−53° (direct), 0.1°; within 1.1° / Belmonte et al. 2010, Table 2
16	Mendes, Naos of Shu (Banebdjed)	31.0°N / ~6.0°	26th Dynasty (c. 600 BCE)	+52¼° (axis reversed), 0.8°; within 1.1° / Shaltout, Belmonte & Fekri 2007, Table 1
17	Siwa, Aghurmi, Oracle of Amun	29.2°N / ~8.1°	26th Dynasty (c. 570 BCE)	−56° (direct), 3.1°; counted by the survey authors as a possible Canopus case / Shaltout, Belmonte & Fekri 2007, Table 1; Belmonte et al. 2016
18	Karnak, Osiris	25.7°N / ~11.5°	30th Dynasty (c. 350 BCE)	+53.6° (axis reversed), 0.8°; within 1.1° / Shaltout & Belmonte 2005, Table 1
19	Tanis, Khonsu	30.8°N / ~6.3°	30th Dynasty (c. 350 BCE)	+54¼° (axis reversed), 1.4°; borderline / Shaltout, Belmonte & Fekri 2007, Table 1
PTOLEMAIC AND ROMAN PERIODS (332 BCE–AD 300)				
20	Philae, Isis	24.0°N / ~13.2°	Ptolemaic (c. 250 BCE)	−53.5° (direct), 0.7°; within 1.1° / Shaltout & Belmonte 2005, Table 1
21	Armant, Mammisi	25.6°N / ~11.7°	Ptolemaic (c. 200 BCE)	−53.1° (direct), 0.4°; within 1.1° / Shaltout & Belmonte 2005, Table 1

#	Temple / Location	Latitude / Canopus Altitude	Epoch / Period	Orientation Status / Source
22	El Kab, Nekhbet (speos)	25.1°N / ~12.2°	Ptolemaic (c. 200 BCE)	−54.3° (direct), 1.6°; borderline / Shaltout & Belmonte 2005, Table 1
23	Siwa, Zeitun, stone temple	29.2°N / ~8.1°	Ptolemaic (c. 200 BCE)	+52½° (axis reversed), 0.2°; within 1.1° / Shaltout, Belmonte & Fekri 2007, Table 1
24	Siwa, Bilad Rum, Khamisa	29.2°N / ~8.1°	Date uncertain (Ptolemaic or Roman assumed)	−52¼° (direct), 0.4°; within 1.1° / Shaltout, Belmonte & Fekri 2007, Table 1

PART II: THE GAP—WHAT EGYPT ITSELF REMEMBERED

We have traced the corridor. We have followed the DNA, the cattle, the eye, the star. We have watched them walk from a green Sahara to the Nile.

But there is a question we have not asked. It is the question Egypt itself asked, every time a king took the throne, every time a priest opened a scroll, every time a builder laid a foundation stone:

Who came before us?

Papers I and II establish the physical case for corridor migration. The corridor is documented in paleohydrology. The migration pressure is documented in 150 radiocarbon dates. The material markers at Hierakonpolis are documented in peer-reviewed publications spanning 2008 to 2024. The genomic endpoints are documented in two 2025 *Nature* papers. What none of this evidence addresses directly is the question of identity: what did the Egyptians call the people whose arrival is written in stone, bone, and DNA? The answer is in the Egyptian textual record—and it has been there for three thousand years.

3. The Structural Argument: A Category the King-List Cannot Do Without

The most important observation in this paper does not require the migration model to be correct. It requires only that the Egyptian textual record be read carefully. The Egyptian king-list structure demands a transitional category between divine time and human kingship. The Shemsu Hor fill that slot consistently across every major source in which it appears.

The Tripartite Sequence

The sequence is consistent across fifteen centuries of independent attestation:

Layer	Egyptian Category	Position in Sequence
Divine era	Divine dynasties (individual gods listed in Manetho)	First — cosmic primordial time
Transitional era	Spirits (Akhu) / Followers of Horus (Shemsu	Second — between divine and

Layer	Egyptian Category	Position in Sequence
	Hor)	human
Historical era	Human kings beginning with Menes	Third — documented human history

This sequence appears in the Turin Royal Canon, the Pyramid Texts, the Coffin Texts' associated ancestral traditions, Manetho's structural framework, and later pharaonic inscriptions. Remove the Shemsu Hor, and the Egyptian king-list has no transitional generation. Wilkinson (1999: 170) confirms that *šmsw Ḥr* was applied to the semi-legendary pre-unification kings associated with the living tradition of Horus-worship at Nekhen. The structural slot is non-optional. What remains to explain is what it encodes.

The Royal Annals of the Old Kingdom — the Palermo Stone and its associated fragments, compiled during the Fifth Dynasty (c. 2494–2345 BCE; Shaw 2000) — independently corroborate this structure from a source more than a thousand years older than the Turin Canon: its first register lists the names of predynastic rulers of Lower Egypt wearing the Red Crown, structurally positioned before the dynastic sequence begins (Wilkinson 2000). The same document carries a second, less-noticed feature bearing on archival specificity. Hertz observed that at the head of the stone the festival of the Shemsu Hor occupies every second year-cell, and read that regular biennial repetition as an incipient era — a scheme for counting time rather than merely naming years (1931, 94). On her reading the practice of keeping annals therefore predates the First Dynasty, and the designation Shemsu Hor was conferred by posterity, taken from those older annals in which the recurring festival may have been the one thing still legible (1931, 95). Whether or not that specific inference is accepted, the structural point stands: the oldest surviving Egyptian historical document records the Shemsu Hor not as a myth but as a recurring entry in a dated series. This is the oldest surviving Egyptian historical text, and its structural logic is identical to the tripartite sequence: predynastic rulers occupy the transitional slot between divine time and Menes.

Comparative Archival Specificity

The claim that the Shemsu Hor archival citations are structurally anomalous requires systematic comparison against other documented primordial or pre-dynastic traditions in the ancient literate world. The following table highlights the dimension of archival medium specificity — whether the tradition names a physical, institutionally recoverable writing material.

Tradition	Pre-dynastic / Primordial Category	Named Physical Archive?	Archival Medium Specified?	Cited in Professional Accountability Context?
Sumerian King List	Antediluvian kings	No	—	No
Berossus (Babylonian)	Antediluvian kings	Yes	Clay tablets buried at Sippar and recovered after the flood	No
Hebrew Patriarchs	Antediluvian figures	No	—	No
Vedic / Hindu	Manvantara rulers	No	—	No
Chinese (Three	Culture heroes	No	—	No

Tradition	Pre-dynastic / Primordial Category	Named Physical Archive?	Archival Medium Specified?	Cited in Professional Accountability Context?
Sovereigns)				
Hittite (Kumarbi cycle)	Primordial kings	No	—	No
Babylonian (Apkallu / Berossus)	Seven sages; pre-flood	No	—	No
Shemsu Hor (Egyptian)	Transitional Followers of Horus	Yes	Leather roll, written annals, architectural plans	Yes (Thutmose I stela; Dendera crypt)

Sources by tradition: Sumerian King List — Jacobsen (1939); Babylonian (Berossos, Apkallu) — Verbrugghe and Wickersham (1996), Burstein (1978); Hebrew patriarchs — Kugel (2007); Vedic/Hindu — Flood (1996); Chinese (Three Sovereigns) — Birrell (1993); Hittite (Kumarbi cycle) — Hoffner (1998); Shemsu Hor — Sethe, Urkunden IV 82–87; Mariette (1870–75); Dümichen (1865).

Of the nine king-list and cosmogonic traditions surveyed, the Shemsu Hor are the only category for which the third archival criterion is met, and the only one in which all three converge: (1) a named physical object type, (2) specified as recoverable through institutional access, and (3) cited in a professional scribal accountability context where falsification would have been professionally risky. The closest external parallel is not merely structural but material. Berossos records that Kronos instructed Xisouthros to bury all the tablets at Sippar before the flood, and that survivors returning to Babylonia dug them up and turned them over to mankind (Verbrugghe and Wickersham 1996; Burstein 1978). That account satisfies criteria (1) and (2): a named medium, deliberately deposited and subsequently recovered. What it does not satisfy is (3). The Sippar tablets appear within a mythological flood narrative, whereas the Shemsu Hor leather roll is invoked in a temple building record, a royal stela and a Karnak inscription — documents produced in contexts where a scribe could be held to account. The distinction the survey establishes is therefore narrower than a claim of general uniqueness, and correspondingly harder to dismiss.

Generic legitimation rhetoric is widespread across Egyptian, Mesopotamian, and broader Near Eastern traditions, yet it typically invokes ancestral authority without material specificity. The Shemsu Hor references uniquely specify *šnw n ʿrq* (leather roll) and gn.wt npy.w-ḥ3.t (annals of predecessors) in state inscriptions and temple foundation contexts.

Response to the Mainstream Interpretation

The observation that the Edfu Building Texts function primarily as cosmogonic temple-foundation mythology is not contested (Reymond 1960; Kurth et al.). The question is whether the distinctive structural features of this particular tradition — a first sacred domain, its destruction, and its re-founding by divine builders who carry sacred-construction knowledge forward — are adequately explained by generic legitimation models. These elements appear at Edfu and are more fully elaborated there than at Dendera, Esna, Kom Ombo, or Philae (Reymond 1960; Kurth 2014), despite equivalent scribal capacity and theological motivation at those sites with active cosmogonic creativity.

The corridor migration model supplies one coherent explanatory mechanism for this distinctiveness without invoking otherwise unattested priestly invention at Edfu alone. The alternative — independent composition of a structurally unusual destruction-and-refounding cosmogony at Edfu while other Ptolemaic temples relied on standard primeval-mound cosmogonies — itself requires justification.

The Shemsu Hor and the Akhu

The Turin Canon lists the Shemsu Hor alongside or in association with the Akhu (Spirits / Transfigured Ones). Waddell's footnote 5 on Manetho Fragment 1 notes that across three independent manuscript traditions — the *Excerpta Latina Barbari*, Africanus (Fr. 6.1), and the Armenian Eusebius — 'Demigods' should be read 'in apposition to Spirits of the Dead': they are the same group in all three traditions. The argument here does not depend on resolving this identification. The structural position of the Shemsu Hor and its functional use as a source of archival authority holds regardless of whether Akhu and Shemsu Hor are synonymous or distinct.

The Shemsu Hor in the King-List Tradition

The Shemsu Hor (“Followers of Horus”) are a fixed category in the Egyptian king-list tradition. The Turin Royal Canon lists them as the last group of predynastic rulers, following the gods and the demigods and spirits and immediately preceding Menes, the first mortal king (Gardiner 1959; Ryholt 2004); the designation *šms.w-ḥr.w* is lexically standard (Wb 4, 486.16–19). Their position in the list is structural and consistent: they occupy the slot between the divine and mortal orders.

Early twentieth-century scholarship sometimes read this category geographically. In his 1940 Loeb edition of Manetho, W. G. Waddell attached a footnote to Manetho’s “spirits of the dead,” suggesting they were “perhaps the Shemsu Hor of the Turin Papyrus,” “men of the falcon clan whose original home was in the western Delta.” This should be treated with caution: the Shemsu Hor are not named in any surviving version of Manetho, and the “western Delta” localization is Waddell’s inference, not a datum of the text. It is noted here as an early interpretation, not as support for the corridor model’s western Saharan origin, which rests on the independent archaeological, genetic, and isotopic evidence set out in Papers I and II.

A King-List Category, Not a Historical Race

The Shemsu Hor’s status as a fixed category in the king-list tradition is secure independently of the corridor hypothesis (Gardiner 1959; Ryholt 2004). The king-list tradition records the category but does not locate it geographically or identify it with any particular population. The corridor model therefore treats the Shemsu Hor as this attested predynastic category and argues their origin entirely from the physical evidence of Papers I and II — the Saharan record, the genetic endpoints, and the isotopic data — rather than from the king-list tradition itself. Earlier attempts to read the group as an intrusive founding race are not relied upon here and are not part of the argument.

The Chronological Window

When Eusebius's later lunar conversion is applied to the 5,813 months Waddell suggests correspond to the Shemsu Hor group, the result (approximately 477 solar years before 3100 BCE = ca. 3577

BCE) places the pre-Menes slot inside the migration window identified on wholly independent grounds. This is noted as a structural coincidence, not as chronological evidence. The conversion is Eusebius's apologetic device, and Waddell explicitly rejects its Egyptological validity.

Relationship to Mainstream Identification

The mainstream Egyptological identification of the Shemsu Hor with the Souls of Pe and Nekhen (Sethe 1905, whose opening chapter treats the Horusdiener directly; Frankfort 1978) is not contested here. The phrase itself titles a major collection of Predynastic studies (Friedman and Adams 1992), an indication of how thoroughly the category is embedded in the field's own vocabulary. If the Horus falcon cult at Hierakonpolis has western Saharan roots — as Papers I and II propose — then its first political instantiation occurs precisely at the site where the hypothesis predicts elite Saharan migrants consolidated.

The geographic tension in the paired tradition — Nekhen in Upper Egypt and Pe/Buto in the Delta — is resolved by the textual record itself. Nekhen (Hierakonpolis) was the original Horus cult center; Pe/Buto was not originally a Horus cult site but was awarded to Horus in the mythological settlement following the unification struggle (Frankfort 1978, 93ff; Hart 1986, 153). Pe enters the tradition through dynastic unification theology requiring paired North-South ancestral claims, not as a second corridor destination. The hypothesis predicts integration at the Horus cult center; that is Hierakonpolis, not Buto. The hypothesis converges with mainstream identification rather than competing with it.

Summary

The Egyptian king-list structure requires a transitional category between divine time and human kingship. The Shemsu Hor fill that slot consistently across fifteen centuries of independent sources. Their archival specificity — named physical media cited in professional accountability contexts — has no clear documented parallel in the surveyed corpus of other ancient king-list and cosmogonic traditions. The Shemsu Hor are a securely attested category in the king-list tradition (Gardiner 1959; Ryholt 2004). The corridor hypothesis treats that attested category as its subject and argues its origin from the independent evidence of Papers I and II. The structural slot is real. What remains to explain is what it encodes.

4. Primary Textual Sources: Fifteen Centuries of Independent Attestation

The Shemsu Hor are documented across multiple primary Egyptian sources spanning nearly fifteen centuries. In every source, they occupy the same structural position: the last pre-dynastic category before human kingship begins.

Source	Date (approx.)	What It States
Turin Royal Canon	ca. 1245 BCE	Listed as collective group before human kings; structural order: Gods → Shemsu Hor → Menes. No individual reign lengths preserved in any surviving fragment.
Pyramid Texts	ca. 2400–2300 BCE	Celestial beings assisting the dead king's ascent, participating in ritual purification, and providing spells for emergence and ascension. PT 34 (Unis): natron purification ritual. PT 525/Spell 473 (Pepi I): they perform

Source	Date (approx.)	What It States
		cleansing and provide spells for emergence and ascension. PT 1245: 'A follower of Horus am I.' PT 32 (Faulkner Utterance 32): 'You are pure with Horus and with the Followers of Horus.'
Coffin Texts	ca. 2100–1700 BCE	No widely accepted explicit mention of *šmsw Ḥr*. However, Spell 493 (de Buck V, 320–324) places the deceased among the Souls of Pe and Nekhen—the ancestral figures mainstream Egyptology identifies with the Shemsu Hor (Sethe 1905; Frankfort 1978). See 4.3.
Teachings of Ptahhotep	ca. 2400–2300 BCE	'A son that hearkeneth is as a Follower of Horus.' Ethical usage demonstrating the term's semantic breadth—following Horus as a moral ideal applicable to living persons. See 4.4.
Tomb of Rekhmire (TT100)	ca. 1450 BCE	The Opening of the Mouth ritual depicts participants within a framework involving Horus and Osiris, illustrating the conceptual association between ritual actors and the divine entourage of Horus (Davies 1943). See 4.5.
Thutmose I, Tombos	ca. 1500 BCE	'Nor has one ever seen it in the annals of predecessors since the Followers-of-Horus.' Explicit invocation of written records from the Shemsu Hor period as a temporal benchmark (Sethe, *Urkunden IV*, 82–87). Sethe's editorial footnote defines the Shemsu Hor as 'the prehistoric kings of Hierakonpolis and Buto, who ruled before Menes, who worshipped the god Horus.'
Merneptah, Karnak	ca. 1210 BCE	Great Karnak Inscription: invokes “the annals of the kings of Lower Egypt” as a temporal benchmark. Does not name the Shemsu Hor; supplies the second term in Hertz’s (1931, 95) identification of the Shemsu Hor with the predynastic kings of Lower Egypt (Mariette 1875, Planches, pl. 53, lines 36–39).
Dendera Temple Crypt	Ptolemaic, ca. 54 BCE	Plans copied from 'a leather roll from the time of the Followers of Horus.' Specific archival designation persisting fifteen centuries after the Shemsu Hor period. See 4.8.
Manetho (structural)	ca. 280 BCE	Gods → Demigods → Spirits → Human kings; sequence preserved, numbers unreliable. Lunar-unit conversion places Shemsu Hor period at ~3577 BCE. See 4.9.

Three features of this record are analytically significant.

First, the Shemsu Hor are invoked across fifteen centuries as ancestral authorities with tangible records. Later pharaohs cite their written annals. Ptolemaic builders cite a leather roll of architectural plans. Standard mythological predecessors—gods, demigods, cosmic beings—are not cited in Egyptian state inscriptions as sources of recoverable archival documents. The Shemsu Hor are.

Second, the category recurs consistently across multiple independent textual traditions. It appears in the royal administrative tradition (Turin Canon), the mortuary-ritual tradition (Pyramid Texts), the wisdom tradition (Ptahhotep), and the temple-building tradition (Dendera, Merneptah). This breadth of independent attestation is not characteristic of ad hoc legitimation invention.

Third, the trajectory of the term's usage moves in the opposite direction from mythological categories. Mythological categories characteristically lose precision and archival specificity over time. The Shemsu Hor do the opposite. In the Pyramid Texts they perform a specific ritual function. In

Ptahhotep the term is extended metaphorically. In the Thutmose I Tombos Stela they possess dated written annals cited in a state inscription. In the Dendera tradition they are named custodians of recoverable architectural plans. Archival specificity increases across fifteen centuries.

The Structural Anomaly: Archival Specificity vs. Cosmic Authority

The claim that the Shemsu Hor archival citations are structurally anomalous requires comparison against all documented pre-dynastic traditions in the ancient literate world. The following table expands the comparison presented earlier in Section 4, adding the crucial dimension of **archival medium specificity** — whether the tradition names a physical writing material recoverable through institutional consultation.

Tradition	Pre-dynastic category	Named physical archive?	Archival medium specified?	Cited in professional accountability context?
Sumerian (King List)	Antediluvian kings	No	—	No
Babylonian (Berossus)	Antediluvian kings	Yes	Clay tablets buried at Sippar and recovered after the flood	No
Hebrew patriarchs	Antediluvian	No	—	No
Vedic/Hindu	Manvantara rulers	No	—	No
Chinese (Three Sovereigns)	Culture heroes	No	—	No
Hittite (Kumarbi cycle)	Primordial kings	No	—	No
Babylonian (Apkallu / Berossus)	Seven sages; pre-flood	No	—	No
Shemsu Hor (Egyptian)	**Transitional Followers of Horus**	**Yes**	**Leather roll, written annals, architectural plans**	**Yes (Thutmose I state stela; Dendera crypt)**

Sources by tradition: Sumerian King List — Jacobsen (1939); Babylonian (Berossos, Apkallu) — Verbrugghe and Wickersham (1996), Burstein (1978); Hebrew patriarchs — Kugel (2007); Vedic/Hindu — Flood (1996); Chinese (Three Sovereigns) — Birrell (1993); Hittite (Kumarbi cycle) — Hoffner (1998); Shemsu Hor — Sethe, Urkunden IV 82–87; Mariette (1870–75); Dümichen (1865).

Of the nine king-list and cosmogonic traditions surveyed, the Shemsu Hor are the only category for which the third archival criterion is met, and the only one in which all three converge: (1) a named physical object type, (2) specified as recoverable through institutional access, and (3) cited in a professional scribal accountability context where falsification would have been possible. Berossos' account of the tablets buried at Sippar and recovered after the flood satisfies (1) and (2) but not (3), appearing within a mythological narrative rather than a scribal accountability document (Verbrugghe and Wickersham 1996; Burstein 1978).

The statistical baseline: Generic legitimation rhetoric across Egyptian, Mesopotamian, and Near Eastern traditions invokes ancestral authority without specifying material form. The Shemsu Hor citations specify *šnw n ʿrq* (leather roll) and gn.wt npy.w-ḥ3.t (annals of predecessors). This level of material specificity in a falsifiable institutional context has no documented parallel in the surveyed corpus.

Response to the mainstream interpretation: The observation that the Edfu narrative functions cosmogonically is not contested here. Reymond (1960) and Kurth et al. are correct: the texts operate as temple foundation mythology. The question is not whether they are mythological — they are — but whether the unusual structural features of this particular mythological tradition (a destroyed first domain, divine builders, transmitted sacred-construction knowledge, the falcon) are adequately explained by generic legitimation models, given that the narrative is more fully elaborated at Edfu than at Dendera, Esna, Kom Ombo, or Philae (Reymond 1960; Kurth 2014) despite equivalent motivation and scribal capacity.

The corridor model supplies one explanatory mechanism for this distinctiveness without requiring otherwise unattested priestly invention at Edfu alone. The alternative — that Edfu's priests independently composed a structurally unusual destruction-and-refounding cosmogony without any source tradition while every other Ptolemaic temple drew on standard primeval-mound cosmogonies — requires its own justification.

Archaeological Confirmation: Leather as a Prestige Writing Material

The Dendera inscription's claim of a "leather roll from the time of the Followers of Horus" describes a specific material object: a leather scroll containing architectural plans. Three independent data points confirm that leather scrolls containing sacred texts and drawings were produced in Egypt from the Old Kingdom onward and remained in use for ritual texts into the Islamic period.

The Cairo Leather Roll (c. 2300–2000 BCE). Rediscovered in the Egyptian Museum in 2015 after being forgotten for over 70 years, this is the oldest and longest Egyptian leather manuscript. It is fragmentary and of unknown provenance, dated on palaeographical and linguistic grounds to between the late Old Kingdom and the early Middle Kingdom (Sherbiny 2017b; 2018, 46). It contains religious spells and portions of the *Book of Two Ways*—a composition previously known only from Middle Kingdom coffins.

The roll carries a large combined pictorial and textual segment of the composition, comparable only to the most lavishly illustrated coffin version known. Sherbiny concludes that variants almost identical to the Hermopolitan coffin material were already known elsewhere in Egypt and documented on much older material, so that the composition’s temporal and spatial boundaries extend well beyond the Middle Kingdom theologians of Hermopolis, who had access to manuscripts of older age and from different religious genres (Sherbiny 2018, 46, 50).

The Dendera Building Inscription (Bauurkunde; Dümichen 1865; Mariette 1870–75). The Dendera building document cites a ground plan found on a roll of leather from the time of the Followers of Horus (see 4.8). This reference specifies the material (a leather roll), the content

(architectural plans), and the source (the time of the Followers of Horus). It is not a generic appeal to ancient authority but a citation of a specific, recoverable physical document.

The Hay Archive of Coptic Spells on Leather (8th–9th century CE). The British Museum's 2022 multidisciplinary study (O'Connell et al.) documents seven leather manuscripts radiocarbon-dated to the 8th–9th century CE, found in Western Thebes—the same region as the HK6 elite cemetery and the Shemsu Hor textual tradition. The study confirms:

- Leather was an unusual writing substrate for Coptic texts, concentrated in Upper Egypt and Lower Nubia—precisely the corridor route.
- The findspot is likely the Monastery of Paul at Deir el-Bakhit in Western Thebes.
- The manuscripts contain explicit invocations of Horus alongside Christian and pre-Christian ritual material.
- The manuscripts were produced by multiple non-professional copyists working within a family or group context.
- The Edfu temple preserves the only surviving temple "House of Books," a chamber whose walls carry a catalogue of the sacred books once kept there, with papyrus scrolls stored in chests in wall niches (Schott 1990).

Significance for the Shemsu Hor Hypothesis. The Cairo Leather Roll confirms that leather scrolls containing sacred texts and drawings were in use from at least the late Old Kingdom, and the Edfu House of Books attests that temples kept catalogued collections of sacred books (Schott 1990). The Dendera inscription's claim of a "leather roll from the time of the Followers of Horus" describing architectural plans is therefore not an isolated, implausible literary invention. It describes a real material practice documented archaeologically across two millennia: from the Old Kingdom Cairo roll through the Ptolemaic Dendera reference to the Islamic-period Hay Archive. The Shemsu Hor leather roll fits a continuous tradition of leather as the medium for sacred, authoritative texts in Egypt.

Why the Structural Anomaly Matters

The legitimation model—that the Shemsu Hor category was invented during state formation to legitimate the Horus dynasty—cannot easily account for why Egyptian scribes would specifically claim the existence of recoverable archival objects rather than simply invoking ancestral authority in general terms. Generic legitimation rhetoric invokes ancestral authority in general terms, as documented across Egyptian, Mesopotamian, and Near Eastern traditions. It does not produce named material forms with specific physical descriptions (a leather roll; specific written plans, not generic ancient wisdom) in professional accountability contexts.

Ancient scribal communities understood the mechanics of institutional authority. They made vague-but-impressive claims, not specific-but-falsifiable ones, unless the specific thing actually existed. A claim that a recoverable scroll can be found and consulted is falsifiable within the scribal community's own institutional context. If the scroll were sought and not found, the inscription would lose authority.

The Shemsu Hor archival citations specify locatable physical objects with named material forms in contexts of professional scribal accountability. The broader Ptolemaic "ancient book" tradition invokes cosmic or divine sources without specifying physical locations or material descriptions. The Shemsu Hor citations specify recoverable objects.

The Cairo Leather Roll and the Hay Archive confirm that leather scrolls of precisely this type were produced and archived in Egypt from the Old Kingdom through the Islamic period. The material practice the Dendera inscription describes was real.

The Sources in Full: Transliterations and Translations

The following quotations are drawn from standard Egyptological editions of the primary sources. Transliterations follow the Manuel de Codage (MdC) system. Translations are literal unless otherwise noted.

4.1 Turin Royal Canon (ca. 1245 BCE)

Edition: Gardiner (1959); Farina (1938); Ryholt (1997). Column 2 of the surviving papyrus lists, before the human kings beginning with Menes (Row 11), two collective categories identified by the terms *Šms.w Ḥr* (Shemsu Hor / Followers of Horus) and *ꜣḫ.w* (Akhu / Spirits). No individual reign lengths are preserved for these categories in any surviving fragment. The '6,000 years' figure that appears in some secondary sources does not occur in the original papyrus; it derives from early 19th-century reconstructions (Lauth, Brugsch) or from cross-reading with Manetho. What the original confirms: the Shemsu Hor are a pre-dynastic collective category, structurally positioned between the gods and the first human king.

4.2 Pyramid Texts (ca. 2375–2181 BCE)

Editions: Allen, James P. 2015. *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts*. Second Edition. SBL Press; Allen, James P. 2005. *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts*. SBL Press; Sethe, K. 1908–1922. *Die altägyptischen Pyramidentexte*. 4 vols. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs.

PT 34 (Unis) — directly verified in Allen 2015, §34; Allen 2005, §22. Transliteration (Allen 2005, Spell 22): *nṯr.tj mḥ.tj ptr mḏd r.k Wnjs šmsw Ḥrw ḫr nṯr.t*. Allen 2015 text (§34, verified): 'Your two natron-jars are the two natron-jars seen by the Followers of Horus under the goddess.' This is part of the natron purification ritual in which the king's mouth is cleansed using natron specifically identified as belonging to the Followers of Horus.

PT 525 / Allen §473 (Pepi I) — directly verified in Allen 2005, p. 164; Allen 2015, §473. Exact transliteration: *wʿb.tw ḥr.f n.k Ppy m šms.w Ḥrw ḥnʿ wsr.t Jnpw*. Allen 2005 translation: 'This Pepi shall be cleaned by Horus's followers, Anubis's throwstick and bow, and they will make for Pepi the spell of emerging and make for this Pepi the spell of ascending.'

PT 1245 — directly verified in Allen 2005, Spell 560 (Sethe PT 1245). Exact transliteration: *šmsw Ḥr jnk*. Translation: 'A follower of Horus am I.'

PT 32 (Faulkner Utterance 32, libation ritual): *wcb.k r.k ḥnc Ḥrw ḥnc šms.w Ḥrw* ('You are pure with Horus and with the Followers of Horus') (Faulkner 1969, Utterance 32). Note: Faulkner's Utterance 26 (Allen Spell 38, p. 8) is the Opening of the Mouth iron ritual—it does not contain the Followers of Horus. This transliteration is correctly attributed to Utterance 32.

What the originals confirm: the Shemsu Hor participate in the ritual purification of the king, acting as divine assistants in the transition to the afterlife. PT 34 provides a direct material link—the ritual natron belongs to them. PT 525 provides the most explicit ritual context: they perform cleansing and provide the spells for emergence and ascension. PT 1245 provides direct first-person identification.

Transmission Note — OIP 132

Allen, James P. 2006 (*The Egyptian Coffin Texts, Volume 8: Middle Kingdom Copies of Pyramid Texts*, Oriental Institute Publications 132) documents that PT spells—including PT 525 and the natron purification formula—were copied onto Middle Kingdom coffins at Lisht, El Bersheh, and Beni Hasan (ca. 2100–1700 BCE). This confirms the Shemsu Hor purification tradition remained in active liturgical use for at least 500 years after the pyramids were built. Allen's preface notes that the same spells were 'not sharply distinguished' from the Coffin Texts, indicating continuous ritual transmission rather than archaic preservation. An independent confirmation of the Wedjat's Old Kingdom institutional embedding is provided by Sugi's (2005) analysis of the 6th Dynasty tomb of Idut at Saqqara: all 96 offering items in the burial chamber's offering lists refer metaphorically to the 'Eye of Horus,' with the ritual's origin traceable to Pyramid Texts Spells 23–171. The Wedjat-as-offering equation was not a Late Period development; it was institutionally embedded in both royal and elite private funerary practice from the earliest Pyramid Texts period forward, contemporaneous with the Shemsu Hor references in the same corpus.

Critical Note on PT Utterances

Other Pyramid Text utterances sometimes cited in connection with the Shemsu Hor (PT 356, 437, 660, 473, 524, 921) do not mention them or are too fragmentary to use as functional evidence. PT 356 refers to *šms.w Stš* ('Followers of Set'); PT 437 refers to the *wr.w P / wr.w Nḫn* ('Great Ones of Buto and Hierakonpolis'), related to but not identical with the Shemsu Hor tradition. The primary-source-verified Shemsu Hor references in Allen's editions are PT 34, PT 525 (Pepi I), and PT 1245. PT 32 (Faulkner Utterance 32, libation ritual) and PT 222 (Neith) remain in the scholarly corpus as traditional citations.

4.3 Coffin Texts (ca. 2100–1700 BCE)

Edition: de Buck, A. and Gardiner, A. 1935–1961. *The Egyptian Coffin Texts*. 7 vols. University of Chicago Press.

Spell 404 — Verified as NOT Shemsu Hor: Spell 404 describes the soul arriving at a doorway guarded by Isis and Nephthys. The Shemsu Hor are not mentioned.

Spell 493 — de Buck, *Coffin Texts*, Vol. V, pp. 320–324 (Faulkner translation Vol. II, pp. 129–131). While the literal term *šmsw Ḥr* does not appear in this spell, the text places the deceased among the Souls of Pe and Nekhen (*bꜣ.w P bꜣ.w Nḫn*)—the ancestral figures mainstream Egyptology identifies with the Shemsu Hor (Sethe 1905; Frankfort 1978). Spell 493 is therefore contextually relevant to the Shemsu Hor tradition, even though it uses the alternative designation *bꜣ.w* rather than *šmsw Ḥr*.

Note on Coffin Texts: No clear, securely attested references to the *šmsw Ḥr* (Followers of Horus) have been identified in the Coffin Texts corpus in standard editions. Claims of their presence should therefore be treated with caution and require explicit citation. The relative absence of *šmsw Ḥr* in this corpus reflects the expansion of afterlife access beyond the royal sphere during the Coffin Texts period. However, as documented in the OIP 132 Transmission Note (4.2), Allen's preface to his 2006

edition confirms that PT spells were 'not sharply distinguished' from the Coffin Texts, indicating continuous ritual transmission across the transition rather than a sharp theological break.

4.4 Teachings of Ptahhotep (ca. 2400–2300 BCE)

Edition: Prisse Papyrus. Translation: Gunn (1912); Lichtheim (1973). Primary source confirmed from scanned Gunn 1912 edition (pp. 57–59). Transliteration (Maxim 41, after Zaba 1956): *zꜣ sḏm pw šmsw Ḥr*. Translation (Gunn 1912, p. 59): 'A son that hearkeneth is as a Follower of Horus. He is good after he hearkeneth; he groweth old, he reacheth honour and reverence.' Translation (Lichtheim 1973): 'The obedient son is a follower of Horus. He prospers after he obeys.'

Gunn's translator footnote (1912, p. 59, footnote to Maxim 41) — verified from primary source: 'The Followers of Horus are a legendary dynasty of demigods, believed by the Egyptians to have ruled for about 13,400 years after the reign of Horus, and before that of Mênês. There is also an order of spirits of this name.'

This footnote is significant on three counts. First, Gunn explicitly identifies the Shemsu Hor as a pre-Menes dynasty, confirming that even in 1912 the term was understood as a historical category, not merely a metaphor for piety. Second, his figure of 13,400 years reflects traditional Egyptian numerology for the pre-dynastic era as it circulated in early 20th-century Egyptological sources—it is a different number from Manetho's 5,813 and the two figures derive from different sources and should not be conflated. Third, Gunn's note that there is 'also an order of spirits of this name' confirms the dual nature of the Shemsu Hor in Egyptian tradition—both a historical pre-dynastic grouping and a spiritual category—mapping directly onto the Turin Canon's listing of them alongside the Akhu.

The term *šmsw Ḥr* in Ptahhotep demonstrates the term's semantic breadth: 'following Horus' was an ethical ideal applicable to living persons, carrying both historical and aspirational meaning simultaneously, as terms for revered ancestral categories commonly do across cultures.

4.5 Tomb of Rekhmire (TT100) (ca. 1450 BCE)

Source: Davies, Norman de Garis. 1943. *The Tomb of Rekh-mi-Rē at Thebes*. 2 vols. Metropolitan Museum of Art. Davies notes (Vol. I, p. 77, n. 19) that the sculptors of the statue of Osiris are depicted as 'ready to join Horus the son in defending it.' The Opening of the Mouth ritual depicted in TT100 includes the sem-priest and ritual participants acting within a mythological framework involving Horus and the defense of Osiris. No direct reference to *šmsw Ḥr* appears in this passage; the scene is included for its illustration of the conceptual association between ritual actors and the divine entourage of Horus.

4.6 Tombos Stela of Thutmose I (ca. 1500 BCE)

Source: Sethe, *Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums IV* (Urk. IV), 82–87. Transliteration: nn m3.t(w) m gn.wt npy.w-ḥ3.t dr šms.w Ḥrw. Translation: 'Nor has one ever seen it in the annals of predecessors since the Followers-of-Horus.' Sethe's editorial footnote (Urk. IV, footnote 4): '*Bezeichnung der vorgeschichtlichen, vor Menes regierenden Könige von Hierakonpolis und Buto, die den Gott Horus verehrten.*' (Designation of the prehistoric kings of Hierakonpolis and Buto, who ruled before Menes, who worshipped the god Horus.) This is the most authoritative scholarly identification of the Shemsu Hor available from the primary sources. The same passage was published independently in the nineteenth century as Lepsius, Denkmäler III, pl. 5, line 15, the edition Hertz used; she renders it 'qui n'a pas été vu dans les annales des ancêtres depuis les Shemsou Hor' (1931, 95).

4.7 Merneptah Inscription, Karnak (ca. 1210 BCE)

Inscription Type: The Great Karnak Inscription of Merneptah, recording the repulse of the Libyan and Mediterranean coalition. Merneptah reused a wall built by Thutmose III to carry the text (Mariette 1875, Texte, 28). Primary Source: Mariette, A. 1875. *Karnak. Étude topographique et archéologique*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, Planches, pl. 52–55 (text at Texte, 75); the passage at issue is pl. 53, lines 36–39. This inscription does not name the Shemsu Hor. It is relevant here only as the second term in Hertz's argument, below, where she renders the line 'cela n'était pas vu depuis les annales des rois de la Basse-Égypte' (1931, 95).

Scholarly Identification: Hertz, Amélia. 1931. 'La Haute et la Basse-Egypte a la fin des temps prehistoriques.' *Revue de l'Égypte ancienne* 3: 81–96. DOI: 10.11588/diglit.32868.12. Hertz states (p. 95): 'Si des listes d'annees tres anciennes sont nommees une fois les annales des Shemsou Hor et une autre fois les annales des rois de la Basse-Egypte, nous sommes obliges d'identifier les Shemsou Hor avec les rois de la Basse-Egypte.' Translation: 'If the very ancient year-lists are named once as the annals of the Shemsu Hor and another time as the annals of the kings of Lower Egypt, we are obliged to identify the Shemsu Hor with the kings of Lower Egypt.'

Hertz reached that conclusion from the Palermo Stone itself. She observed that at the head of the stone the festival of the Shemsu Hor appears in every second year-cell, and read the regular repetition of a single festival in the year-names as an emerging attempt at an era: 'La constante et régulière répétition d'une même fête dans les noms des années montre déjà une tendance à créer une sorte d'ère' (1931, 94). From this she inferred that annals were being written long before the First Dynasty, and that the designation Shemsu Hor was applied by posterity rather than self-assumed — taken from those annals, where the biennial festival may have been all that remained legible: 'Ce ne sont pas donc eux-mêmes, mais la postérité que leur a donné le nom de Shemsou Hor, quelle devait avoir trouvé dans leurs annales' (1931, 95). She adds that the Turin Canon lists nineteen chiefs of the White Wall and nineteen venerables of the North before the Shemsu Hor, which she took as evidence that records survived for Lower Egyptian rulers and not for those of the South (1931, 95). The physical artefact Hertz's textual observation describes is the Royal Annals of the Old Kingdom — the Palermo Stone and its associated fragments. Its first register lists the predynastic rulers of Lower Egypt, wearing the Red Crown, immediately before the dynastic sequence begins. Wilkinson's (2000) critical edition of the Royal Annals establishes this structural reading on palaeographic grounds and confirms that these predynastic Lower Egyptian rulers occupy precisely the transitional slot between divine time and Menes that the king-list tradition requires. The convergence of Hertz's textual argument with the physical evidence of the Palermo Stone strengthens the identification of the Shemsu Hor with the predynastic rulers of Lower Egypt documented in the oldest surviving Egyptian historical text.

Consensus Note: Hertz's argument turns on the contrast between two designations, not on a Shemsu Hor reference in Merneptah's own text: Thutmose I invokes the annals "since the Shemsu Hor" (Urk. IV, 82–87; A.6), while Merneptah invokes the annals of the kings of Lower Egypt. Her identification remains historically significant as an interpretation but is not accepted as definitive in current scholarship, which generally reads such invocations as ancestral topoi rather than evidence of a concrete dynasty. Nevertheless, the underlying textual observation—that archaic annals linked the Shemsu Hor with pre-unification rulers of Lower Egypt—continues to inform discussions of Egyptian state formation.

4.8 Dendera Building Inscription (Bauurkunde)

Primary sources: Dümichen, J. 1865. *Bauurkunde der Tempelanlagen von Dendera, in einem der geheimen Corridore im Innern der Tempelmauer aufgefunden und erläuternd mitgetheilt*. Leipzig: J.C.

Hinrichs; Mariette, A. 1870–75. *Dendérah: description générale du grand temple de cette ville*. Paris (Universitätsbibliothek Heidelberg digital edition). The Dendera building document, recovered from a cavity in the temple's brick wall, records that the temple's ground plan was found written in ancient script upon a roll of leather from the time of the Followers of Horus (Hor-shesu), preserved through restorations by earlier kings and renewed under Thutmose III. In the reading of the inscription published by Dümichen (1865): "There was found the great ground plan … in ancient drawing, upon a roll of leather of the time of Hor-shesu. It was found in the interior of the brick wall of the south side of the temple …" The inscription's attribution of the plan to the Followers of Horus is a claim internal to the temple's own foundation tradition; modern Egyptology generally reads such statements as a legitimation topos affirming the antiquity of the temple's design rather than as evidence of a surviving predynastic document. What it establishes is that the Dendera tradition itself named a specific written archive — a leather roll — attributed to the Shemsu Hor. Two qualifications belong with that statement, both visible in Dümichen's own edition. First, he marked the crucial phrase as uncertain: his rendering of Plate XV, lines 37–40 reads "zur Zeit der Nachfolger (?) des Horus" — in the time of the followers (?) of Horus — with the query mark his own. Second, Dendera preserves a second and competing attribution. Plate XVI, lines a–b assign the recovered plan not to the Shemsu Hor but to the Fourth Dynasty: "aufgefunden worden in Schriften alten aus der Zeit des Königs Chufu", found in ancient writings from the time of King Khufu. Dümichen himself, weighing the two, resolved in favour of the Khufu reading in his summary. The temple therefore records a written archive twice over, once attributed to the Followers of Horus and once to the builder of the Great Pyramid; what is constant across both is the claim to a document, on skin, recovered from the brick wall of the South House under Pepi.

4.9 Manetho's Aegyptiaca (ca. 280 BCE)

Source: Loeb Classical Library edition, Fr. 1, from Eusebius. Transmitted also by Africanus and Syncellus with divergent numbers. Key passage on time units: 'The year I take, however, to be a lunar one, consisting, that is, of 30 days: what we now call a month the Egyptians used formerly to style a year.'

Loeb apparatus, Footnote 2 on Fragment 1: 'There is no evidence that the Egyptian year was ever equal to a month' — Waddell explicitly rejects the lunar conversion as having no independent Egyptological validity. The conversion was introduced by Eusebius of Caesarea (ca. 340 CE) for the purpose of harmonising Egyptian pre-dynastic chronology with biblical flood timelines.

Loeb apparatus, Footnote 5 on Fragment 1: Waddell identifies the group to which the 5,813-month figure attaches as 'perhaps the Shemsu Hor, the Followers or Worshippers of Horus, of the Turin Papyrus: see H.R. Hall, *Cambridge Ancient History*, i. p. 265.' Waddell further notes, drawing on V. Gordon Childe (*New Light on the Most Ancient East*, 1934, p. 8) and Breasted (*Bull. Instit. Fr. Arch. Or. 30*, Cairo 1930, pp. 710ff.), that 'the Shemsu Hor, the men of the Falcon Clan whose original home was in the West Delta, had formed an earlier united kingdom by conquering Upper Egypt.' These are early-twentieth-century readings and should be treated with caution: the Shemsu Hor are not named in any surviving version of Manetho, so Waddell's identification is an interpretive linkage to the Turin Papyrus, and the "West Delta" localization is his inference rather than a datum of the text (cf. Section 3). The corridor model does not rest on this footnote; its western Saharan origin is argued from the independent evidence of Papers I and II. What the passage does document securely is that the large pre-dynastic figures derive from a lunar-year conversion that Waddell himself rejected (Footnote 2) and that Eusebius introduced for biblical harmonization.

Structural observation: when Eusebius's conversion is applied to the 5,813 months Waddell suggests correspond to the Shemsu Hor group, the result (approximately 477 solar years counted back from 3100 BCE ≈ 3577 BCE) places the pre-Menes slot inside the migration window identified on wholly independent grounds. This is a structural coincidence, not chronological evidence. Waddell explicitly rejects Eusebius's conversion as Egyptologically invalid.

---

5. Archaeological Correlates: The Material Record of Arrival

Texts record the Shemsu Hor as a generation before kings, with records, plans, and annals. The archaeological record at Hierakonpolis documents a set of material markers consistent with contact with—and integration of—Saharan pastoral populations during the window ca. 3800–3100 BCE. Each marker is published in peer-reviewed sources. Full analysis appears in Paper II of this Series.

Five Pastoral Markers at Hierakonpolis

The following five markers appear together at Hierakonpolis within the same archaeological window; four are documented at HK6, the fifth is a site-level cranial line.

Material Marker	Date (BCE)	Primary Source	Archaeological Context
Dung fuel use	Appears abruptly ca. 3700	Marinova et al. 2013	Characteristic of mobile pastoralists without access to riverine wood. Not adopted by existing Nilotic communities with abundant wood resources.
Balanites aegyptiaca offerings	ca. 3800–3200	Fahmy, Friedman and Fadl 2008	Desert date tree, growing near Hierakonpolis by the Naqada period (Fahmy, Friedman and Fadl 2008: 169), whether native there or brought by the corridor population; food offering in elite HK6 graves, as in other Predynastic cemeteries (p. 175).
Livestock horn modification	ca. 3700 (oldest in Egypt, among earliest in Africa)	Van Neer, De Cupere and Friedman 2024	Practice requiring generations of sustained intentional tradition. Documented at Nabta Playa in Green Sahara rock art. Chain: Sahara → HK6 → Kerma.
Bat cow goddess emblem	Naqada IC–IIA, Tomb 16	Hendrickx 2002	Earliest attestation in Egypt. Connects iconographically to Nabta Playa cattle cult imagery. Appears at the site mainstream Egyptology identifies as the primary Shemsu Hor context.
Morphological diversity	ca. 3800–3100	Zakrzewski and Powell 2011	45 Quibell-excavated Hierakonpolis crania (Duckworth Collection), compared by the authors against the non-elite cemetery HK43 rather than HK6, show diversity and variable cranial affinities relative to other Egyptian Predynastic series. A site-level line, not an HK6 one.

Individually, each marker could be explained by regional interaction or diffusion — *Balanites*, horn modification, and dung fuel use all appear in the Egyptian Western Desert record as well. The marker

that would most directly bear on population movement is morphological diversity, since skeletal variation cannot arrive through trade or cultural borrowing alone. Here the evidence is suggestive rather than decisive, and its provenance must be stated precisely: the 45 Hierakonpolis crania analysed by Zakrzewski and Powell (2011) are Quibell-excavated specimens in the Duckworth Collection, compared by the authors against the non-elite cemetery HK43, not against HK6. They report diversity and variable cranial affinities relative to other Egyptian Predynastic series. Independently, Prowse and Lovell (1996) found that the high-status cemetery at Naqada represents an endogamous elite segment more closely related to populations in northern Nubia than to neighbouring southern Egyptian groups — a result consistent with elite distinctiveness, though it too falls short of demonstrating migration. Whether that variability requires incoming population rather than local heterogeneity is not settled by cranial data alone — Zakrzewski (2007) frames the same question as continuity versus change and finds substantially for continuity. The morphological evidence is therefore consistent with population movement but does not by itself establish it.

Site-Specificity: HK6 vs. Naqada Cemeteries T and B

The corridor hypothesis predicts integration specifically at the Horus cult center (Hierakonpolis/Nekhen), not at the rival Seth cult center (Naqada/Nubt). A comparison between HK6 and contemporaneous Naqada elite cemeteries (Cemetery T, Naqada IIC–IIIA; Cemetery B, Naqada IID–IIIA) tests this prediction.

Pastoral Marker	HK6 (Hierakonpolis)	Naqada T / B	Primary Sources
Cattle skull / bucrania deposits	High frequency in elite burials	Rare / absent in published elite contexts	Van Neer et al. 2004, 2014; Hendrickx 2002
Wild desert fauna offerings	Present, diverse assemblage	Lower diversity documented	Van Neer et al. 2004; Gautier and Van Neer 2009
Baboon imports	Documented, 20 individuals, multiple species	Not documented	Van Neer, De Cupere and Friedman 2026
Horn deformation (sheep/goat)	Earliest evidence in Egypt (c. 3700 BCE)	Not reported	Van Neer, De Cupere and Friedman 2024
Balanites aegyptiaca offerings	Prominent in elite graves	Absent in published Naqada reports	Fahmy, Friedman and Fadl 2008; Hendrickx 2002
Bat cow goddess emblem	Present (Tomb 16, Naqada IC–IIA)	Absent	Hendrickx 2002
Morphological diversity (cranial)	Diversity and variable cranial affinities (n=45; Hierakonpolis site-level, not HK6)	No systematic published comparison available	Zakrzewski and Powell 2011

Quantitative takeaway: The pastoral prestige package is markedly stronger at HK6 than at contemporaneous Naqada elite cemeteries (T and B). Cattle skull deposits, wild desert fauna, baboon imports and horn deformation are all documented at higher frequency or exclusively at HK6, while Balanites, though prominent in its elite graves, was a common Predynastic offering also recorded elsewhere (Fahmy, Friedman and Fadl 2008: 175); the bat cow goddess emblem has its earliest Egyptian attestation at Hierakonpolis (Tomb 16). The Hierakonpolis cranial sample (n=45) shows diversity and variable affinities, but it is a site-level sample rather than an HK6 one, and Zakrzewski

(2007) reads the same question substantially for continuity; it is consistent with population movement without establishing it. No comparable elite Naqada sample has yet been systematically analysed. This co-occurrence and site-specific concentration at the primary Horus cult center — contrasted with its weaker or absent expression at the rival Seth-associated Naqada cemeteries — is consistent with elite integration of incoming corridor populations specifically at Nekhen.

Caveat and future work: A full quantitative comparison of HK6 with Naqada Cemeteries T and B remains a priority for future work (Prediction 3b). The absence data reported above reflect the current state of publication; systematic archaeozoological and botanical comparison of Naqada elite contexts has not yet been undertaken. The corridor hypothesis predicts that such a comparison will confirm the site-specific pattern documented here.

The funerary temple at HK6 (Structure E8) remained in documented ritual use for nearly a millennium. Dynasty 3 deposits appear at walls still standing 1,000 years after construction — a pattern of institutional continuity consistent with the archival and architectural authority the Shemsu Hor textual tradition attributes to this generation.

Tattooed Mummies from Gebelein

Additional evidence for a rich symbolic repertoire in late Predynastic Upper Egypt comes from the tattooed mummies from Gebelein (Friedman et al. 2018). Radiocarbon dated to 3351–3017 cal BC:

- A male individual (British Museum EA 32751) bears figural tattoos of wild cattle (*Bos primigenius*) and Barbary sheep (*Ammotragus lervia*), motifs well attested in both Predynastic Egyptian art and Saharan rock art traditions.

- A female individual (EA 32752) displays curved S-shaped motifs on the shoulder and arm.

Figural tattooing was practiced by both sexes during this period. The lead author, Renée Friedman, is also the principal excavator of the HK6 elite cemetery at Hierakonpolis, situating these tattooed individuals within the same broad cultural horizon documented at that site.

The Qustul Incense Burner and Nubian Peer Relationship

The Qustul incense burner (ca. 3300–3000 BCE, Cemetery L, Tomb 24) documents a peer-culture relationship with Nubia during the Shemsu Hor window. Williams read the accompanying animal figures as a falcon and a lion; Gatto (1997a: 44, restated 2006: 71) reads the second as a baboon, which bears on the HK6 baboon material discussed above. On Williams' influential but contested reconstruction, the A-Group bears the same elite iconography — White Crown, Horus falcon, a bound prisoner led to sacrifice — though later reassessment notes that key elements rest on damaged or missing sections of the piece. Mainstream positions vary between Egyptian influence and shared elite symbolism (Gatto 2021; Wengrow 2006). The corridor hypothesis interprets this as consistent with a shared ancestral tradition.

Two Phases of Corridor Interaction

Phase	Date	Evidence
Phase 1	3800–3100 BCE	HK6 material package appears with traditions associated with Saharan pastoralists
Phase 2	c. 3100 BCE	Sorghum cultivation knowledge circulating in the Saharo-Nilotic corridor (Winchell et al. 2017); donkey domestication producing transport intensification at unification, with Abydos skeletons showing load-bearing osteopathologies consistent with sustained use (Rossel et al. 2008)

Animal Burials at HK6: Selective Acquisition

Beyond the pastoral markers above, the HK6 elite cemetery contains an exceptional range of animal burials: baboons, elephants, aurochs (wild cattle), crocodiles, leopards, and cats (Van Neer et al. 2004, 2014; Van Neer, De Cupere, and Friedman 2026; for the current excavation record see Droux, Friedman, and Pieri 2024). Gatto (2006: 70) reads the animal burials in the A-Group elite cemeteries at Naga Wadi and Qustul as a borrowing of the Hierakonpolis practice, attested at HK6 from Naqada IIA–B, rather than as a continuation of Badarian or Sudanese Neolithic custom — a direction of transmission running from Upper Egypt southward. The acquisition and control of these species required exceptional effort—long-distance transport, dangerous capture, or sustained captive care.

The skeletons record that effort directly. Van Neer and colleagues examined the wild mammals from HK6 and found violence-related pathology on twenty of the thirty-eight wild mammals recovered at that point: fifteen anubis baboons (Papio anubis), a leopard, a jungle cat, a hartebeest, an aurochs and a hippopotamus. Most are healed fractures from blows — the Tomb 12 baboons alone carry forty-seven, among them a parry fracture on a left ulna, the injury characteristic of warding off a strike aimed at the head — with a smaller group attributable to tethering. The animals lived long enough for those injuries to heal and for age to show: the Tomb 12 baboons were at least seven years old and some over ten. One hartebeest carried a foetus of about three months when she was killed, while the pathologies on her mandible had taken longer than that to form, so she had conceived in captivity, with a male kept alongside her. The authors conclude that the animals were held in captivity for a prolonged period after their capture (Van Neer et al. 2015). The contrast with later Egyptian animal cemeteries is sharp: at Abydos, Tuna el-Gebel, Gabanet el-Girou and Saqqara the dominant pathologies are metabolic — the malnutrition and bone deformity of confinement in the dark — rather than trauma. The HK6 animals were caught and handled; the later ones were housed.

Baboons: Long-Distance Import

Van Neer, De Cupere and Friedman (2026) report 20 baboon individuals (*Papio hamadryas* and *Papio anubis*) from the HK6 elite cemetery, the earliest evidence for the occurrence of these primates in Egypt, buried in the Naqada IC–IIB phase, dated in this series to c. 3800–3600 BCE after Van Neer et al. (2014). Buried in groups of up to eight individuals or as single interments, across five of the cemetery's mortuary complexes and spanning several generations, they represent repeated acquisition rather than a single event. One young animal shows signs of rickets, suggesting local birth, but the authors conclude the baboons were not routinely bred on site and may have been imported on

several occasions, indicating "more complex trade interactions with the lands to the far south than previously assumed."

Hamadryas baboons are native to the Horn of Africa (Eritrea, Ethiopia, Somalia)—the region of Punt—as confirmed by isotopic analysis of mummified baboons from later periods (Dominy et al. 2020). Their presence at HK6 provides evidence for repeated long-distance acquisition, consistent with emerging exchange networks reaching the Red Sea and sub-Saharan Africa during the Shemsu Hor window. Later, baboons became the sacred animal of Thoth, god of writing, timekeeping, and lunar cycles (Te Velde 1990; Kessler 1989). Whether this later religious significance has roots in Predynastic acquisition practices remains speculative.

Elephants: From Familiar to Rare

By the late Predynastic period (c. 3800–3100 BCE) the elephant was an exotic in the Nile Valley, though elephants are attested in regions such as Nabta Playa and the Eastern Desert (Pöllath 2009). The elephants buried at Hierakonpolis HK6 (Naqada IC–IIB, c. 3800–3600 BCE; Van Neer et al. 2014), each in its own monumental tomb, were among “a range of wild and exotic species”, kept in captivity on fodder of Acacia twigs and emmer (Marinova et al. 2013). In the far west, by contrast, elephants survived in Mauritania until the 1980s (Bouché et al. 2009). The HK6 elephants may reflect the selective acquisition of a culturally familiar yet increasingly inaccessible animal.

Elephants are rare in Predynastic faunal assemblages overall (Gautier and Van Neer 2009; Linseele and Van Neer 2009), reinforcing their status as exceptional acquisitions. A developing symbolic significance is suggested by the appearance of an elephant-on-mountain standard in a late Predynastic royal tableau at Wadi Magar, a sign that may name a Predynastic Upper Egyptian ruler (Yale Egyptology n.d.), and by the persistence of elephant imagery in later Egyptian iconography as a marker of southern or exotic power (Hendrickx 2002).

Aurochs (Wild Cattle): Control Over Wild Herds

Wild cattle (aurochs, *Bos primigenius*) were present at HK6 alongside domestic cattle, distinguished by their larger size and distinct morphology (Van Neer et al. 2004). Unlike domestic cattle, which were herded, aurochs required capture from wild herds—a more dangerous and logistically demanding undertaking. Their presence in elite burials signals control over wild, untamed animals.

Bovine symbolism is prominent in Predynastic iconography (Hendrickx 2002). The ability to acquire and control wild cattle aligns with patterns of animal control that later appear formalized in cattle-related cult traditions, including Hathor (cow goddess) and the Apis bull (Wilkinson 1999).

Crocodiles: Control Over Apex Predators

Crocodiles—though native to the Nile—required considerable skill and risk to capture. Whole crocodile burials at HK6 (Van Neer et al. 2004) indicate deliberate control over a dangerous animal. Unlike baboons and elephants, crocodiles did not require long-distance acquisition; their significance lies in the mastery of a locally available but formidable creature.

Crocodiles later became central to the cult of Sobek, a god associated with kingship and the Nile's power (Zecchi 2010). While formal cults are not attested until the Early Dynastic period, the early

control of crocodiles at HK6 suggests that the capacity to master the Nile's most dangerous creature was already a marker of elite status.

Leopards: Predator Control and Elite Ritual

Leopards, native to the Eastern Desert, were also present at HK6 (Van Neer et al. 2014). Their capture and burial required control over a dangerous predator, though they did not require importation. The leopard skin, rather than the animal itself, later becomes the primary symbolic medium in elite ritual contexts.

Leopard skins were worn by *sem*-priests in the Opening of the Mouth ceremony (Roth 1993) and appear on early royal statues (Wilkinson 1999). The early presence of leopards at HK6 may represent an early instance of the symbolic association between predator control and ritual authority.

Cats: Controlled Animals and Feline Deities

Van Neer et al. (2014) documented a pit burial at HK6 containing six cats—a male adult, a female adult, and four kittens from two simultaneous litters—dated to Naqada IC–IIB (ca. 3800–3600 BCE). The simultaneous litters indicate year-round captive feeding, because wild Egyptian cats breed once annually following seasonal food availability. These are controlled animals. They predate the next comparable Egyptian evidence by nearly 2,000 years and appear in the same cemetery that contains the cattle burials, dung fuel deposits, *Balanites* offerings, and morphologically diverse human population. No local developmental sequence at Hierakonpolis precedes them (Van Neer et al. 2014).

Unlike baboons and elephants, cats were native to the region; the African wildcat (*Felis lybica lybica*) is native to the full North African range (De Martino et al. 2025). Their significance lies not in importation but in control: year-round captive feeding of a species that normally breeds seasonally required sustained human intervention. The De Martino et al. (2025) genomic study refined understanding of domestic cat ancestry, demonstrating that North Africa played a significant role alongside the Near East in the species' expansion.

The institutional connection between feline control and later Egyptian religion is documented independently:

- **Mafdet**, the first feline deity in Egyptian religion, appears at the opening of the First Dynasty. She presents the hearts of wrongdoers to the pharaoh "like cats that present humans with prey" (Wilkinson 1999: 251).

- A Fourth Dynasty seal of Menkaure bears the epithet "Horus: Bull-bodied, beloved of Mafdet" (Wilkinson 1999: 196), documenting direct institutional linkage between the Horus royal tradition and this feline deity.

- **Bastet** is one of the feline goddesses with whom the Eye is personified: as the Eye of Ra, the Wedjat has a violent lioness aspect (Sekhmet) and a pacified cat aspect (Bastet) (Wilkinson 2003; de Cenival 1988).

The chronological gap between the HK6 cat burials (c. 3800–3600 BCE) and the earliest feline deities (First Dynasty, c. 3100 BCE onward) is substantial. Whether the HK6 evidence represents a direct antecedent or a separate phenomenon remains an open question.

Summary: Selective Acquisition of Ecologically Retreating Animals

Across these taxa, the HK6 faunal assemblage consistently emphasizes species whose acquisition required exceptional effort:

Animal	Acquisition Challenge	Control Challenge	Later Symbolic Role
Baboon	Long-distance import (Horn of Africa)	Captive care, multiple generations	Thoth (writing, timekeeping)
Elephant	Southern origin, rarity in Nile	Captive care, own tomb	Royal power, exotic prestige
Aurochs	Wild herd capture	Control over non-domesticated cattle	Hathor, Apis
Crocodile	Local, but dangerous	Capture of apex predator	Sobek (kingship, Nile power)
Leopard	Local, but dangerous	Capture of predator	Elite ritual, leopard skins
Cat	Local, but requires year-round care	Captive breeding, sustained feeding	Mafdet, Bastet (protection, kingship)

The pattern is not a random sample of the local ecosystem (Van Neer et al. 2004, 2014; Van Neer, De Cupere, and Friedman 2026). As ecological ranges contracted during the aridification of the late Predynastic, access to such animals required increasing effort, transforming formerly widespread fauna into socially valuable and logistically demanding acquisitions. The HK6 elite cemetery provides archaeological evidence for the process by which control over exotic and dangerous animals became a marker of elite status—a process that scholars have long argued was central to Predynastic state formation (Wengrow 2006; Köhler 2010; O'Connor 2002). Wengrow's indigenous state-formation model does not address the genetic or astronomical evidence presented in this paper.

Human Funerary Intervention in the Fezzan Corridor

Funerary treatment provides an archaeological indicator of symbolic and ritual behavior in prehistoric societies. The Fezzan corridor preserves evidence of intentional post-mortem body treatment during the Shemsu Hor window.

Uan Muhuggiag: Intentional Body Treatment

The Uan Muhuggiag rock shelter in the Tadrart Acacus Mountains (Fezzan corridor) yielded the mummified body of a child approximately 2.5–3 years old, radiocarbon dated to 5405 ± 180 BP (calibrated c. 4600–3800 BCE) (Mori and Ascenzi 1959; Ascenzi 1980; re-examined radiologically and pathologically by Giuffra et al. 2010). The body shows clear evidence of intentional post-mortem intervention:

- A long abdominal incision indicates evisceration
- The body cavity was filled with an organic preservative

- The remains were wrapped in antelope skin and leaves
- An ostrich eggshell necklace was placed around the neck
- The body was arranged in a fetal position

Radiological, histological, and chemical analyses support the anthropogenic nature of these treatments (Mori and Ascenzi 1959). This represents one of the earliest securely documented cases of intentional post-mortem body treatment in Africa. The Uan Muhuggiag child is not an isolated case; natural mummification is also attested in the Wadi Tanezzuft region during the Pastoral period (c. 5000 –3000 BCE), indicating a broader context of preserved human remains in the Fezzan corridor (di Lernia, Cremaschi and Manzi 2008).

Contemporary Egyptian Evidence: A Debate

During the same chronological window (c. 3600–3400 BCE), Egyptian evidence for intentional mummification is debated:

- **Jones et al. (2018)** analyzed Turin mummy S.293 (Egyptian Museum Turin, RCGE 16550), an intact Predynastic mummy believed to originate from Gebelein or the surrounding Upper Egyptian region, and identified intentional embalming treatment: a plant oil, heated conifer resin, an aromatic plant extract, and a plant gum/sugar were mixed and used to impregnate the funerary textiles. The authors interpret this as evidence of an embalming recipe predating previously recognized Egyptian examples by approximately 1,500 years.
- **The British Museum's CT-imaging programme (Taylor & Antoine 2014)** examined Gebelein Man B and found no evidence of evisceration or resin treatment, concluding the body was naturally desiccated by the desert sand and that preservation was accidental.

The debate remains unresolved. Egyptian Predynastic evidence is contested, whereas the Uan Muhuggiag child shows clear and widely accepted intentional intervention.

A Broader North African Behavioral Horizon

The Uan Muhuggiag child demonstrates that complex funerary intervention was practiced in the Fezzan corridor during the mid–late 4th millennium BCE—the same window in which the corridor hypothesis places pastoralist populations moving toward the Nile Valley. The current evidence does not resolve whether these practices developed independently or through interregional interaction, but it establishes their contemporaneity across North Africa. Intentional body treatment was not unique to the Nile Valley but formed part of a broader North African behavioral horizon during this period, for which the Fezzan corridor provides some of the earliest secure evidence.

The Mechanism: From Corridor Arrival to Dynastic State

The internal competition and aggregation model of Upper Egyptian state formation—Hierakonpolis, Naqada, and Thinis as rival polities, with the Thinite lineage ultimately dominant—is the established framework for how unification occurred (Köhler 2010; Wengrow 2006). The corridor migration

hypothesis does not replace this model. It offers an explanation for why Hierakonpolis entered that competition with a specific and durable cultural advantage.

Chronological priority of HK6. The HK6 elite cemetery is consistently the earliest and most elaborate of the three competing centers. Its radiocarbon dates place peak activity generations before comparable elite contexts appear at Naqada or Abydos.

The settlement matches that priority in scale. Deep coring documents continuous occupation at Hierakonpolis from the Badarian period, about 4400 BCE, and by 3700 BCE the site had become the largest settlement on the Nile, extending nearly three kilometres across the low desert (Aziz, Friedman and Attia 2026). Its monumental architecture is of the same order. At Locality HK29B, adjacent to the HK29A ceremonial centre and aligned with it, a palisade of closely set wooden posts in a cut trench runs for some fifty excavated metres, with a further eighteen traced by ground-penetrating radar before the signal terminated; it is one of the largest constructions known for the Predynastic period, and on the excavators' estimate it enclosed more than a hectare of ceremonial, administrative and manufacturing space. The survey reads the wall as a barrier against the floodwaters of an adjacent Nile channel and the hippopotami and crocodiles that came with them, as much as a mark of status, and finds that the channel destroyed its north-western stretch. Its authors suggest the structure may be the prototype for the later temenos walls that enclosed Egyptian palaces and temples — an architectural tradition beginning here and carried forward into the sacred architecture of the dynastic state, which is the kind of transmitted building knowledge the Shemsu Hor tradition attributes to this generation. The survey concerns the site's own development and makes no claim about Saharan migration.

Cultic priority of Hierakonpolis. The Horus falcon cult is established at Hierakonpolis before it becomes the royal cult of unified Egypt. The first identified named rulers—Scorpion I, Iry-Hor, Ka—are associated with the Upper Egyptian Horus-king tradition with its deepest roots at Nekhen. Dynasty 0 does not emerge from Naqada or Thinis. It emerges from the cultural tradition already most fully developed at the site where the hypothesis places the primary integration of Saharan pastoral populations with Nilotic communities.

Integration, not conquest. A population arriving from the western Saharan corridor with a coherent cultural package—cattle cosmology, Osirian astronomical tradition, specific symbolic vocabulary, institutional memory of a destroyed homeland—would have found at Hierakonpolis an established Nilotic community and an existing tradition of elite formation. The synthesis of these populations produced the earliest and most elaborate elite center in Upper Egypt.

The cultural advantage was not military but symbolic: the Horus falcon cult, the Osirian astronomical tradition, the herd for the dead, the architectural knowledge attributed to the Shemsu Hor. When the three-polity competition resolved in favor of the Thinite lineage, the Thinite rulers adopted this symbolic system rather than displacing it. This pattern is documented in comparative cases: the Roman absorption of Greek religion, the Akkadian adoption of Sumerian scribal tradition, and the Zhou appropriation of Shang ritual forms.

The Horus cult at Hierakonpolis had achieved cultural dominance and institutional embedding before Thinite political victory. The Horus falcon became the royal symbol of the unified state. The Osirian

funerary religion became the state mortuary theology. The traditions consolidated at Hierakonpolis became the institutional vocabulary of dynastic Egypt.

Explaining a persistent puzzle. This explains why the symbolic and religious system of the unified state is so thoroughly associated with Hierakonpolis and the Horus cult, even though the First Dynasty rulers were Thinite. The Horus cult at Hierakonpolis had already achieved cultural dominance before political unification—because it was the synthesis point of the longest-established elite tradition in Upper Egypt, itself the product of integration building since approximately 3800 BCE.

PART III: THE SHEMSU HOR FILL THE GAP

We have followed the DNA. We have traced the symbols. We have watched the star set. We have read the king-lists, the Pyramid Texts, the inscriptions that name the Shemsu Hor as the generation before kings.

Now we put it together.

6. The Three-Layer Alignment

The following table synthesises three lines of evidence: **textual**, **environmental**, and **archaeological**—into a single chronological framework. Each layer was derived from its own primary sources. Their alignment is the core argument of this paper. Note on independence: the textual boundary and the archaeological boundary in this table both describe the same event—the opening of legible Egyptian history at 3100 BCE. They are not two independent chronologies converging on that date; they are two descriptions of the same threshold. The genuinely independent convergence is the climate chronology—derived from 150 radiocarbon-dated Saharan excavations with no internal connection to Egyptian textual categories—meeting that single defined historical boundary.

Period (BCE)	Environmental / Migration Context	Textual Memory (Egyptian)	Archaeological Evidence
9700–5300	Green Sahara in full operation; stable climate; populations settled across Saharan basin	Gods (Turin Canon, Col. 1); Zep Tepi—the First Time of cosmic order	Nabta Playa megaliths; cattle burials; rock art; astronomical alignments
5300–3800	African Humid Period collapses; Sahara aridifies; populations begin sustained movement toward permanent water	Heroes / Demigods (Manetho structural echo); transitional beings between divine and ancestral	Western Desert oases occupied; Wadi Howar pastoral communities (Rilly 2016); Badarian culture emergence
3800–3100	Maximum migration pressure; Saharan sites abandoned; populations concentrate in Nile corridor	Shemsu Hor—pre-dynastic ancestors with records, annals, and building plans	HK6 elite cemetery; five material markers at Hierakonpolis; Naqada II–III florescence; Qustul iconography; Dynasty 0 serekhs
3100 BCE	Sahara essentially uninhabitable; migration complete; Nile Valley consolidated	Human kings begin—Menes opens Dynasty I (Turin Canon)	Narmer Palette; First Dynasty tombs at Abydos; hieroglyphic writing established

Three chronologies—derived from climate science, Egyptological textual analysis, and Predynastic archaeology—converge on a terminal boundary. A note on precision is appropriate: the climate signal documents Saharan abandonment across a range—systematic site desertion beginning ~5,300 BCE, concentrated eastward movement after ~4,000 BCE, near-total abandonment by approximately 3,500 BCE. The convergence is not on a single date but on a window whose terminal boundary coincides with political unification at 3100 BCE. This remains consistent, not sharp. What carries independent evidential weight in the textual tradition is not its terminal date but its geographic and narrative content: the destroyed original domain, the transmitted sacred-construction knowledge, and the divine builders who re-establish it. This content is not derived from the archaeological record of state formation. It is what requires explanation regardless of when the historical record opens. Alternative explanations are evaluated in Part V.

7. What This Framework Achieves

Achievement	Explanation
Structural coherence	Transforms the non-optional king-list transitional slot into a historical framework without forcing numerical alignment or requiring textual literalism
Textual integrity	Uses primary Egyptian sources as primary evidence, treating them on their own terms; demotes Manetho's numbers to structural confirmation only
Archaeological alignment	Each proposed phase has independently datable physical evidence from multiple sites across multiple disciplines
Environmental grounding	The migration timeline matches the documented climate sequence: African Humid Period onset, peak, collapse, and Nile Valley consolidation
Avoids overreach	Claims structural correspondence and historical plausibility—not identity of specific individuals, not proof of direct causation
Falsifiable	Generates ten specific predictions testable against existing museum collections and established analytical methods

PART IV: WHAT THEY BUILT

The Shemsu Hor generation did not vanish. They built. What they built endured for three millennia. Part IV documents the institutional traces they left: the Edfu Building Texts preserving memory of a lost first domain and its re-founding (Reymond 1960: 14–17), eight independent regional witnesses documenting the qualitative transformation at 3100 BCE, the corridor-complexity model for the emergence of writing, and the feline tradition—from the earliest controlled cats in Egypt at the Horus cult center to Mafdet protecting the first pharaoh to Bastet restoring the Wedjat Eye. Each line is documented. Each generates testable predictions.

8. The Edfu Building Texts

Part I documented two independent bodies of evidence: the Belmonte surveys of temple orientations (Tier 1) and the Wedjat binary system (Tier 2). The Edfu Building Texts constitute a third, independent body of evidence. The surveys measure what Egyptian builders built. The texts record principles those builders claimed to follow. The two were produced separately, by different methods, more than two thousand years apart. Their convergence is the subject of this section.

The Distinction Between Compilation Date and Source Date

The Edfu Building Texts were inscribed in the Ptolemaic period (237–57 BCE). That is the date of their physical carving, not necessarily the date of their content. The German Edfu Project, the current authoritative scholarly translation, states that some Edfu inscriptions "transmit ideas that come from the eldest epochs of pharaonic history" and are "often consulted as an aid in understanding older sources" (Academy of Sciences of Gottingen, Edfu Project description). This is the peer-reviewed institutional standard, funded by two German national academic bodies across thirty years.

A terminological distinction is necessary. The Edfu temple corpus contains two textually distinct bodies:

Corpus	Location	Content	Date of Content
General building inscription	Throughout temple	Construction chronology, chamber descriptions, ritual programmes	Ptolemaic (standard)
Cosmogonical records	Inner face of enclosure wall (*Edfou VI*, 2014)	Primeval-age creation account: the primeval island and its destruction, re-founded as sacred space by the Shebtiu and the falcon (Reymond 1960)	Carved in the Ptolemaic period but transmitting older material (Göttingen Edfu Project; Reymond 1960)

The primeval-age creation account belongs to the cosmogonical records, not to the general building inscription. Criticisms that treat the Edfu texts as a single "Ptolemaic ancient book" conflate these two corpora.

What Sets the Edfu Cosmogony Apart

Among the major Ptolemaic temple cosmogonies — Edfu, Dendera, Esna, Kom Ombo, and Philae — the Edfu Building Texts contain the most fully elaborated account of the temple's own origin (Reymond 1960). The others draw largely on the standard Egyptian vocabulary of creation: the primordial waters, the first emergence, the solar creator, the primeval mound.

Edfu develops something more specific. Its cosmogony recounts a first sacred domain that is created, destroyed, and then re-founded — the falcon alighting on the perch and the Shebtiu establishing the sacred place that becomes the prototype of the temple (Reymond 1960; *Edfou VI*, 2014). It is this sequence — an original domain lost and rebuilt — rather than the generic primeval mound shared across the temples, that is distinctive to the Edfu account, and that gives the text its interest for the corridor model developed in Papers I and II.

Temple Archives and the Leather-Roll Medium

Egyptian temples maintained working archives. The Ptolemaic temple of Horus at Edfu preserves the only surviving example of a temple "House of Books" (*pr-mḏ3t*): a small chamber off the outer columned hall whose walls carry a catalogue of the sacred books once kept there, with papyrus scrolls stored in chests set into wall niches (Schott 1990). The institution behind the Edfu and Dendera inscriptions was one that catalogued, stored, and copied written documents as a matter of routine.

This is the context in which the Dendera building inscription's reference to a leather roll should be read. It differs from the broader "ancient book" trope of Ptolemaic literature: where the "Book of Thoth found in a divine source" invokes a cosmic or celestial origin, the Dendera reference names a specific physical document — a leather roll — of a kind that had a real place in Egyptian record-keeping.

Leather rolls were a genuine, if less common, Egyptian writing medium. The Cairo Leather Roll (late Old Kingdom to early Middle Kingdom) is the oldest surviving Egyptian leather manuscript (Section 4). The British Museum's 2022 study of the Hay Archive of Coptic spells on leather (O'Connell et al. 2022) documents leather manuscripts from Western Thebes and notes that leather was an unusual writing substrate concentrated in Upper Egypt and Lower Nubia. The Dendera inscription's reference to a leather roll therefore describes a plausible material practice, not a literary invention.

The Sequence the Cosmogonical Text Records

The standard English translation and analysis of the Edfu cosmogonical records is Reymond (1960), working from the hieroglyphic transcriptions later revised by the German Edfu Project (Kurth, *Edfou VI*, 2014). Read on its own terms, the text records a compact sequence. Three of its elements bear on the present argument.

The First Occasion. The narrative is set at the *sp tpj*, the First Occasion — the moment of first creation. Its protagonist is described by Reymond as the Sanctified God who came into being at the First Occasion. The scribes locate the events not in ordinary time but at the origin point of the world — the same Zep Tepi horizon invoked throughout the earlier Egyptian record.

A first sacred domain, and its destruction. The text names a primeval island — its principal name the Island of Trampling (*iw titi*) — that arises in the primeval waters and passes through successive states. Reymond's reconstruction includes a phase of confrontation and destruction in which the first sacred domain is undone. A lost original sacred place stands at the head of the sequence.

Re-founding by divine builders. After the destruction, a company of creator-beings — the Shebtiu, associated with the falcon — establish a new sacred place, the Djeba in Wetjeset-Neter, which becomes the prototype of the temple. The narrative's driving action is the carrying-forward of sacred-construction knowledge from a destroyed first domain to a newly founded one.

Reymond (1960) argued that these records preserve conceptions older than their Ptolemaic carving — that the scribes transmitted an inherited tradition rather than composing freely. The texts cannot be dated precisely and this antiquity is Reymond's interpretation rather than a settled result; but it is widely accepted that Ptolemaic temple cosmogonies can preserve much older theological material.

Read literally and at the level of structure, this sequence — an original sacred domain, its loss, and its re-establishment by builders who carry the tradition forward — is the same shape as the corridor model developed in Papers I and II: a Saharan homeland at the Richat Structure, rendered uninhabitable at the end of the African Humid Period, its population carrying accumulated practice northeast into the Nile Valley. The paper reads the Edfu sequence as consonant with that corridor.

Connection to the Wedjat and HK6 Feline Tradition

The Wedjat is bound to a feline tradition through its solar aspect. As the Eye of Ra, the Wedjat is personified as a goddess with both a violent lioness form and a pacified cat form, equated across Egyptian tradition with Sekhmet, Bastet, and Tefnut (Wilkinson 2003); in the "Myth of the Sun's Eye" / Distant Goddess cycle, the Eye departs as a raging lioness and returns, placated, as a cat (de Cenival 1988). This is the solar Eye of Ra, closely associated in Egyptian theology with the lunar Eye of Horus — both termed *wedjat*. The feline-Eye theology is securely attested from the Old Kingdom onward; the corridor model reads the feline burials at the Predynastic Hierakonpolis cemetery (HK6) as an earlier expression of the same association.

The cosmogonical records and the Wedjat sky-schema share a documented institutional home in the same Edfu tradition. Analysis of the 6th Dynasty tomb of Idut at Saqqara reveals that each of the 96 offering items in the burial chamber's offering lists refers metaphorically to the "Eye of Horus," with the ritual's origin traceable to Pyramid Texts Spells 23–171 (Sugi 2005). The Wedjat-as-offering equation was institutionally embedded in both royal and elite private funerary practice from the earliest Pyramid Texts period forward—contemporaneous with the Shemsu Hor references in the same corpus.

What the Edfu Evidence Establishes

The Edfu Building Texts are Ptolemaic compilations, not contemporary records. Their value is structural corroboration, not independent primary evidence. The weight of the textual argument in this paper rests on the earlier sources (Turin Canon, Pyramid Texts, Thutmose I, Merneptah), not on the Ptolemaic compilation.

What the Edfu evidence establishes:

- The cosmogony's narrative structure — a first sacred domain, its destruction, and its re-founding by divine builders — is more fully elaborated at Edfu than at any other Ptolemaic temple corpus (Reymond 1960; Kurth 2014).
- The German Edfu Project's institutional position confirms the cosmogonical records transmit material from "the eldest epochs of pharaonic history."
- Read structurally, the sequence — a lost original domain and builders who re-establish it — runs parallel to the corridor model developed in Papers I and II.
- The narrative converges structurally with the Shemsu Hor textual tradition (Pyramid Texts, from c. 2345 BCE) and the archaeological evidence at HK6.
- The British Museum's Hay Archive study confirms that leather scrolls containing ritual texts were produced and archived in Thebes, providing independent archaeological grounding for the "leather roll" claim.

What the Edfu evidence does not establish:

- That the cosmogony is a literal record of historical events rather than a mythologized foundation tradition.

- That the transmission chain was uninterrupted or the content unchanged across 2,500 years.

Summary

The Edfu Building Texts preserve a cosmogonic narrative — a first sacred domain, its destruction, and its re-founding by divine builders — more fully elaborated at Edfu than at any other Ptolemaic temple corpus. Reymond (1960) and the German Edfu Project hold that these records transmit material older than their Ptolemaic carving. The Hay Archive provides independent archaeological evidence that leather scrolls of the type described in the Dendera inscription were produced in Thebes. On the reading of Reymond (1960) and the German Edfu Project, the Ptolemaic scribes were transmitting an older tradition rather than composing freely.

9. The External Witness Framework: Eight Perspectives on Egypt's Emergence

The corridor migration hypothesis generates a testable external prediction: if Egypt underwent approximately 700 years of internal formation before sudden state-scale projection at 3100 BCE, contemporary neighbours should document a qualitative threshold—a transformation from limited bilateral contacts to simultaneous multi-directional state projection—rather than a continuous gradual expansion. Eight independent regional witnesses are consistent with this pattern. Pre-unification contacts with the Levant and Canaan are archaeologically attested from approximately 3200 BCE (Dynasty 0), so Egypt was not invisible to its neighbours before 3100 BCE. What the eight witnesses collectively document is a specific qualitative transformation: from limited, building-phase bilateral contacts into simultaneous multi-directional colonial projection at documented 1,400 km scale, concentrated within a single reign. Under Narmer: approximately 20 serekhs across 8–9 Canaanite sites simultaneously (seven of which remain uncertain or controversial in the literature), Egyptian pottery produced in Canaan, royal mining inscriptions in Sinai, military projection to the second cataract—all within a single generation. No preceding period shows coordinated multi-directional state-level projection at this geographic scale. What requires explanation is not that Egypt existed before 3100 BCE but that a qualitative threshold was crossed—from internal formation to outward state expression—at this specific moment.

The Eight Witnesses

The eight witnesses are presented in order of evidential strength, not geography. The first four—Levant, Nubia, Mesopotamia, and Sinai—rest on directly dated, multi-artefact, multi-site documentation of the qualitative shift at 3100 BCE. The remaining four provide contextual support or structural completeness but carry lighter evidential weight: Pre-Kerma is corridor-relevant but left no independent records; Byblos infers the pre-existing relationship from linguistic encoding rather than pre-3100 BCE artefacts; the Chalcolithic Levant rests on an interpretive reversal argument; and Crete documents a single artefact category at a single site. The argument for a qualitative threshold rests on the first four. The latter four are supporting context.

Levant (Southern Canaan), 3100–3000 BCE. The sharpest external witness. Egyptian political artifacts before 3100 BCE are exceptionally rare in Canaan. Beginning ca. 3100 BCE under Narmer,

Egyptian administrative colonies appear at Tel Erani and En Besor: bread molds, clay sealings, and Egyptian-style ceramics produced locally bearing Narmer's serekh. This is not gradual infiltration. It is organised colonial administration appearing within a single archaeological horizon (Braun 2002; Gophna 1992).

Nubia (A-Group), 3300–3100 BCE. The A-Group is the only external witness overlapping the full Shemsu Hor window. The Qustul incense burner (Cemetery L, Tomb 24, ca. 3300–3000 BCE) bears, on Williams' influential but contested reconstruction, iconography read as matching contemporaneous Upper Egyptian elite imagery: White Crown, Horus falcon, palace façade, bound prisoner. Current consensus treats this as evidence of shared elite culture rather than Nubian origins for Egyptian kingship (Bianchi 2004; Wengrow 2006; Gatto 2021)—precisely the peer-culture relationship the migration model predicts.

The simultaneity of royal iconography in Qustul Cemetery L and in contemporary Upper Egypt (Williams 1986) is not adequately explained by diffusion in either direction. The corridor hypothesis offers a more direct account. The A-Group occupied territory directly on the corridor's northeastern arc; Hierakonpolis lies at its Nile destination. The shared iconographic vocabulary—falcon serekhs, victory scenes, the White Crown—is consistent with either shared ancestral heritage from the same deep North African Neolithic lineage (Salem et al. 2025 documents this lineage at Takarkori along the Fezzan route) or intensive mutual exchange along the active corridor route. The scholarly debate on direction of influence is noted (Williams 1986; Adams 1985; Gatto 2021): recent reassessments place Egyptian iconography at Abydos and Hierakonpolis Tomb 100 earlier than the Qustul censer, suggesting Egyptian-to-Nubian transmission as the more likely direction for specific items. What either interpretation confirms for the corridor hypothesis is that the route between these populations was active, culturally productive, and operating during the Shemsu Hor window—which is what the corridor model requires. The genetic relationship between A-Group populations and the Takarkori lineage is a direct test: Prediction 8 targets this. This relationship is documented in detail in Paper II of this Series.

Mesopotamia (Uruk / Sumer), 3500–3100 BCE. During the Shemsu Hor window, Mesopotamia documents Egypt as a recipient of eastern prestige technology: cylinder seals appear in Egypt from Naqada IIc-d (c. 3500–3300 BCE) without local antecedents, reflecting a largely one-way transfer of administrative and iconographic influence from Mesopotamia into Egypt (Honoré 2007; Hill 2016). Egypt was not invisible to Mesopotamia—it was a documented trade recipient, absorbing Mesopotamian seal technology, architectural motifs, and ceremonial mace-head forms. The earliest Egyptian cylinder seals are clearly similar to earlier Uruk seals and may have been manufactured by Mesopotamian craftsmen. After unification, the directionality reverses: Egypt no longer absorbs Mesopotamian symbolic systems but projects its own colonial administrative apparatus eastward into Canaan under Narmer within a single generation. The diagnostic shift is not visibility but direction: importer of Mesopotamian prestige technology becomes a regional projector of Egyptian state power.

Sinai Peninsula, 3200 BCE onward. Wadi Ameyra preserves approximately 60 rock carvings spanning from Naqada IIIA (ca. 3200 BCE) through early Dynasty II, documenting royal mining expeditions for Iry-Hor, Narmer, Djer, and Neithhotep (Tallet and Laisney 2012; Tallet 2015, inscriptions nos. 273–335). Wadi Khamila (Nour El-Din and Morenz 2025) adds one of the earliest known smiting scenes. Together these constitute a colonial territorial marking network confirming that Egypt's post-unification projection was simultaneous in multiple directions.

Pre-Kerma Upper Nubia, 3800–3100 BCE. South of the A-Group, along the proposed corridor route, pre-Kerma populations occupied the Kerma heartland throughout the full Shemsu Hor window. A

single Kerma-period burial recently excavated in the Bayuda Desert (Badura et al. 2025; see Section 11) contained an inverted bowl of a type the excavators note also appears in A-Group and C-Group graves — a suggestive but isolated instance of shared Nubian funerary practice. Its ancient-DNA analysis failed to yield usable results, so it supplies no genetic link between these populations. They left no independent records of Egypt during the formation period. The trajectory after 3100 BCE is stark: the Early Dynastic Egyptian state extended authority to the second cataract in Nubia—deep into modern Sudan, approximately 1,000 km south of Cairo—where there is evidence that political centralisation was in progress around Qustul but may have prompted a preemptive Egyptian military strike (Trigger 1976; Wengrow 2006). The A-Group was eliminated as an independent polity. The pre-Kerma cultures south of the second cataract, surviving beyond the Egyptian expansion front, subsequently consolidated into the Kerma civilisation—which emerges in Egyptian records as a named, explicitly documented political entity and eventual military adversary. The progression from corridor-adjacent ancestral population to named Egyptian rival mirrors the pattern documented throughout this section: the formation period is invisible; projection creates legible political relationships.

Byblos (Lebanon), from 3100 BCE. The 'Byblos ship' (*kbnyt*) became the Egyptian word for a seagoing vessel—a naming that presupposes established, familiar contact. The earliest documented Egyptian-Byblos contacts date to the First and Second Dynasties: a stone vessel fragment bearing the name of the Second Dynasty ruler Khasekhemwy has been recovered from Byblos, and cedar imports to Egypt are attested from the First Dynasty period (ca. 3100–2890 BCE) (Sowada 2009: 1–4, 245–247; Ward 2010). These earliest contacts are precisely contemporaneous with the 3100 BCE emergence window. From Byblos's perspective, Egypt does not appear gradually in the archaeological record—it arrives as an organised, established trading partner at the beginning of the Early Dynastic Period, with a standardised vocabulary for maritime trade already encoded in its language. The Palermo Stone's record of Snefru receiving forty ships of cedar (ca. 2600 BCE) documents the mature form of a relationship that began at unification, not its origin. Note on evidential weight: the relationship is inferred from linguistic encoding (*kbnyt*) and from First Dynasty cedar imports; pre-3100 BCE Egyptian artefacts at Byblos itself have not been documented. This witness contributes structural context rather than direct dating evidence.

The Chalcolithic Southern Levant (Ghassulian/Beersheba culture), 4000–3300 BCE. The Ghassulian-Beersheba Chalcolithic culture of the southern Levant was the copper-producing interior that supplied predynastic Egypt through the Maadi trading hub in Lower Egypt. The Maadi settlement near Cairo—a key site for interconnections between the Nile Valley and the Southern Levant—shows active copper imports and storage architecture with affinities to the Beersheba Chalcolithic tradition (Braun 2009; Gophna 1992). The Chalcolithic Beersheba culture had no writing and left no political records of Egypt during the formation period. The diagnostic shift at unification is striking precisely because of the distance: Narmer's serekh appears at Tel Arad—in the northeastern Negev, roughly 30 km east of Beersheba (Encyclopaedia Judaica, “Arad”) and approximately 400 km from the Nile Delta, one of the deepest interior penetrations of Egyptian administrative presence documented in the Levant (Braun 2009). Egypt reached Tel Arad for Dead Sea asphalt, needed for waterproofing ships and mummification. The copper-exporting interior zone that had been Egypt's trade partner becomes an Egyptian resource-extraction target within a single generation. The greater the distance, the more dramatic the reversal: 400 km of arid Negev interior, with zero prior Egyptian political presence, becomes an administrative reach-point simultaneously with the coastal projections. Note on evidential

weight: the 'reversal' framing is interpretive—the shift from trade partner to resource-extraction target is inferred from artefact distribution rather than directly documented in contemporary records.

Crete and the Aegean, 3200–3100 BCE. Pre-dynastic Egyptian stone vessels appear at Knossos in the centuries immediately preceding unification. Egypt enters the Cretan record as a supplier of prestige goods, not as a developing state. Sustained political contact intensifies only after 3100 BCE. Note on evidential weight: this witness rests on a single artefact category at a single site; it contributes structural completeness rather than independent evidentiary weight.

Multi-Vector Expansion at 3100 BCE

At unification, Egypt projected organised state capacity across a documented span of approximately 1,400 km—from Tel Lod near modern Tel Aviv in the northwest to the second cataract in modern Sudan in the south—simultaneously. The northern Levant: cedar from Byblos. The Canaanite coast: administrative colonies at Tel Erani and En Besor. The Negev interior: Narmer's serekh at Tel Arad, 400 km from the Nile Delta, reaching into arid territory for Dead Sea asphalt. The east: royal mining inscriptions at Wadi Ameyra in Sinai. The south: Egyptian authority eliminating the A-Group polity and reaching the second cataract. Before Narmer, only one serekh of Ka and one inscription of Iry-Hor had been found across all of Canaan. Under Narmer: approximately 20 serekhs across 8–9 Canaanite sites simultaneously, seven of which remain uncertain or controversial in the literature (van den Brink 1992; Braun 2009). No preceding period shows coordinated multi-directional projection at this geographic scale. This is what 700 years of internal formation produces at the moment of political consolidation.

The Trade Direction Reversal

Tomb U-j at Abydos (ca. 3150 BCE): over 400 imported Levantine wine jars with grape residue confirmed by chemical analysis, over 150 ivory and bone labels bearing the earliest known Egyptian hieroglyphs, lapis lazuli from Afghanistan. The assemblage itself demonstrates significant administrative capacity and wealth concentration—the labels with the earliest hieroglyphs are evidence of the same organisational infrastructure documented in Section 10. But this capacity was directed inward: elite consumption management, archival record-keeping, and luxury procurement for a single court. By the reign of Narmer, Egyptian pottery was being produced in Canaan bearing his name. The diagnostic shift is not the scale of organisation—Tomb U-j already shows that—but its direction: from inward elite management to outward territorial colonial administration across a documented 1,400 km span simultaneously. That directional transformation in a single generation is archaeologically verifiable and requires no inference.

The Dynastic Race Theory: Corrected

Flinders Petrie's Dynastic Race Theory held that a biologically distinct Mesopotamian group arrived by conquest and founded the First Dynasty. It is not accepted today. Ancient DNA research supports long-term Nile Valley population continuity combined with gradual gene flow, not wholesale population replacement; Keita and Boyce (2005) reached the same conclusion from the geographical patterning of Y-chromosome variation, reading the Egyptian Nile as a linear oasis within the eastern Sahara rather than as a corridor of replacement. Petrie himself explicitly identified the 'Dynastic Race' with the 'Followers of Horus' (Petrie 1939; Emery 1961). The corridor hypothesis retains the insight of external influence while correcting the source: western Saharan corridor migration with gradual demographic and cultural synthesis, not Mesopotamian conquest—exactly the pattern the aDNA evidence supports.

10. Writing: From Corridor Complexity to Administrative Control

The earliest Egyptian hieroglyphs appear at Tomb U-j (Abydos, c. 3320–3150 BCE) as a fully developed system: numerals, place names, royal titles, and administrative inventory records (Dreyer 1998). This appearance has long puzzled Egyptologists. The standard explanation—that earlier stages did not survive on perishable materials—is partially correct but insufficient. A more productive question is: what were the conditions that made a standardized writing system not merely possible but structurally necessary at precisely this moment, and not earlier?

A terminological distinction is required at the outset. This section distinguishes between pre-writing symbolic systems—marks, tallies, iconography, and engravings that carry cultural meaning but do not demonstrably encode spoken language—and true writing, defined as a system capable of encoding linguistic elements. Egyptian hieroglyphs represent the transition point where a pre-existing symbolic system acquired linguistic capacity. Naqada pottery marks (c. 4000 BCE) and cylinder seal iconography are pre-writing in this sense. The U-j labels (c. 3320–3150 BCE), which encode royal names through phonetic mechanisms, are the earliest currently documented crossing of that threshold in Egypt.

The components of that transition existed long before 3150 BCE as separate, locally functioning systems. Symbolic representation: Naqada pottery marks (c. 4000 BCE) show repeated signs that would later become hieroglyphs (Regulski 2016). Shared administrative technology: cylinder seals used across Egypt, Nubia, and the Levant (c. 3480–3110 BCE) created a common visual vocabulary for controlling goods (Hill 2016). The Messak Settafet plateau in the Fezzan contains tens of thousands of rock engravings representing a rich symbolic tradition (Lutz and Lutz 1995; Le Quellec 2011). Le Quellec (2013), reviewing the chronology of the central Saharan styles against the climatic sequence, places the engravings in the Mesāk style itself — for which he notes a broad scholarly consensus — principally between 4500 and 4000 cal. BC, within the interval bounded by the abrupt arid events of 6200 and 2200 BCE during which domestic cattle are massively represented in the rock images. He is explicit that this rests on association and stylistic seriation rather than on direct dating: three radiocarbon determinations on the organic fraction of dark patina at the Mesāk cannot be used to date the petroglyphs, both because diagenesis may alter the ages and because atmospheric dust is the principal source of the manganese in desert varnish, so that part of the organic material analysed is likely to be airborne and the dates correspondingly too old. Their status as proto-writing in a strict linguistic sense is not claimed here. Kammerzell (2013) documents multiple speech communities coexisting in Archaic Egypt, showing traces of complex linguistic interaction in the earliest written sources—a demographic context consistent with corridor migration. What was missing was not these components. What was missing was the pressure that forced them to operate together simultaneously at state scale.

That pressure came from what this paper terms corridor complexity—the interdependent demographic, economic, and symbolic systems created by converging migration and exchange. These components define its structural anatomy:

- **Identity encoding** — linking goods to origin and authority (place names, royal titles)
- **Sign standardization** — repeated administrative use enforces consistent forms (cylinder seals, pottery marks, tags)

- **Material substrates** — wood, ivory, and tags constrain sign shapes, favouring linear-pictorial development distinct from cuneiform; the same administrative pressure in Mesopotamia produced wedge signs because clay was the available surface—identical pressures, different materials, independent scripts
- **Information persistence** — human memory fails when transactions are delayed, actors distributed, quantities large, and authority indirect; writing becomes externalized cognitive storage
- **Auditability** — tamper-evident sealings allow verification, theft prevention, and dispute resolution across distances
- **Labour specialization** — the complexity of early writing systems required specialists, producing proto-scribal roles embedded in elite institutions—a new control class
- **Demography** — corridor migration increased population diversity, driving administrative complexity across linguistic communities (Kammerzell 2013)
- **Trade networks** — long-distance exchange (cedar from Lebanon, lapis lazuli from Afghanistan, ivory and gold from Nubia) required durable records independent of the individuals who moved the goods
- **Cylinder seal infrastructure** — Hill (2016) documents a glyptic continuum from Naqada IId (c. 3480 BCE) to Dynasty 0 (c. 3110 BCE) across Egypt, A-Group Nubia, and 'En Besor in southern Palestine—a shared administrative technology spanning the corridor's full geographic reach before writing crystallised
- **Elite institutions** — centralized redistributive systems (HK6 elite tombs, Tomb U-j) required persistent, verifiable records of goods and authority; writing emerged within power structures, not as a social communication tool
- **Territorial administration** — control of geographic domains required place-signs encoding specific regions, contributing toponyms to the earliest hieroglyphic inventory
- **Logistical complexity** — spatial separation between production, storage, and consumption required durable transportable records; when goods travel further than memory can follow, writing becomes necessary

What follows is not a linear narrative of invention but a model of administrative convergence. Writing appears when multiple pre-existing systems—symbolic, economic, and institutional—must operate together at scale simultaneously. The corridor did not provide writing; it provided the complexity that made writing structurally necessary.

The answer to the timing question—why 3150 BCE and not 3400 or 3600—follows directly from this framework. Each component existed earlier in locally functioning form. Naqada marks were in use. Cylinder seals were circulating. Trade networks were operating. Elite institutions were forming. What political unification at c. 3100 BCE imposed was the requirement that all of these systems operate together simultaneously across a unified territory. The components did not need to be invented. They needed to be made interdependent. That interdependence is what writing formalised. The same convergence dynamic explains why Mesopotamia reached the writing threshold earlier: urbanisation

and temple economies forced administrative interdependence at scale before Egyptian corridor complexity did. Identical mechanism, different timing, independent development.

The transition from administrative notation to true writing—the linguistic activation moment—is visible in the U-j assemblage itself. The earliest labels encode quantities and place-signs, which require no phonetic capacity. But they also encode royal names, which do: a sign cannot simply picture a name; it must encode its sound. This is the rebus principle, the mechanism by which symbolic systems acquire phonetic capacity. The U-j tags show it already operational by 3150 BCE. Here the corridor hypothesis makes its most specific contribution to the writing question: corridor migration generated the documented demographic reality of multiple speech communities coexisting in Archaic Egypt (Kammerzell 2013). Any administrative system attempting to track named individuals, territorial authority, and goods across linguistically diverse populations faces a structural pressure the rebus principle resolves. Generic administrative convergence—which any sufficiently complex polity might generate—does not explain why phonetic encoding would be necessary. Linguistic diversity does: when names cannot be pictured and must be sound-encoded across community boundaries, phonetic writing becomes the solution. The corridor hypothesis proposes a specific mechanism: corridor migration generated the documented multilingual demographic reality of Archaic Egypt (Kammerzell 2013), and phonetic encoding solved the administrative problem that multilingualism creates. This is a research proposition—the demographic diversity is documented; whether corridor migration was its decisive phonetic catalyst awaits further empirical grounding.

Writing did not begin primarily as language. It began as control. The U-j tomb labels exemplify the result: a system encoding quantities, place names, royal identity, and phonetically represented proper nouns (Dreyer 1998). Once established, writing functioned as a feedback mechanism—enabling more complex administration, which required more writing, which enabled further territorial and economic expansion. The administrative threshold was not merely crossed. It became self-reinforcing. The corridor evolved:

- **3800–3400 BCE** → pastoralist mobility and demographic diversification
- **3400–3200 BCE** → trade intensification and cylinder seal infrastructure expansion
- **3200–3100 BCE** → political consolidation, territorial integration, system crystallization

Writing emerged not when components existed individually but when they were required to operate together. Writing was not humanity's first script for language. It was its first algorithm for power.

Note: This section introduces a framework linking 'corridor complexity' to the emergence of Egyptian hieroglyphs (c. 3320–3150 BCE), building on established administrative complexity models (Dreyer 1998; Regulski 2016; Hill 2016). The same convergence pattern—symbolic density, economic scale, logistical complexity, and institutional control converging within an interconnected regional network—appears independently in Mesopotamia and Proto-Elamite Iran, indicating that early writing systems emerge as administrative technologies rather than through linear invention or direct transmission. The corridor's specific contribution was not the provision of symbols but the generation of the demographic and logistical complexity that made their formalization structurally necessary.

11. A Note on Nubian Funerary Practice

A single Kerma-period burial at site BP937 in the Bayuda Desert of Sudan (Badura et al. 2025; ca. 2050–1750 BCE) contained two vessels, one upright and one an inverted bowl. The excavators note

that inverted bowls of this type also occur in A-Group and C-Group burials, and read the gesture as a possible symbolic “emptying of life”; they describe this particular burial as without close known parallel and its significance as unresolved, and its ancient-DNA analysis failed to yield usable results. The recurrence of the inverted-bowl practice across A-Group (ca. 3700–2800 BCE), C-Group (ca. 2500–1500 BCE), and Kerma (ca. 2050–1750 BCE) contexts is a suggestive thread of shared Nubian funerary practice along the corridor route. A single burial cannot, on its own, establish population or ritual continuity, and the corridor argument does not rest on it; it is noted here as consistent with sustained activity along the route rather than as evidence for it. Paper II discusses the burial in more detail.

PART V: ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATIONS

No hypothesis stands alone. If the corridor migration model is wrong, something else must account for the six converging lines of evidence documented in Parts I through IV. This Part evaluates the strongest alternatives against that standard:

- **Section 12** — The Structural Memory Model (the argument that the Shemsu Hor category was constructed during state formation as legitimation rhetoric) and the Egyptian Western Desert (Nabta Playa) model, which accepts Saharan-to-Nile movement but locates the source in Egypt's own oases rather than the far western Sahara. Two common objections—the transmission gap and the cosmological west—are also addressed here.
- **Section 13** — Four additional frameworks evaluated against all six evidence lines simultaneously: trade/diffusion, independent development, climate forcing alone, and a sustained Saharan network without discrete migration.
- **Section 14** — Explicitly acknowledged limitations of the corridor model.

The goal is not to dismiss alternatives but to establish whether any currently published framework accounts for the full dataset with equal or greater parsimony. If one does, the decisive tests named in Section 15 will distinguish between them. If none does, the corridor model remains the most parsimonious available explanation—pending those tests.

12. The Structural Memory Model: The Strongest Alternative

One clarification is important before evaluating the strongest alternative. The actual mainstream Egyptological consensus, following Sethe (1905) and Frankfort (1978), does not claim the Shemsu Hor were invented during state formation. Sethe identified them as the prehistoric rulers of Upper and Lower Egypt at Nekhen and Pe; Frankfort (1978) established the Souls of Pe and Nekhen—the mainstream identification for the Shemsu Hor—as real ancestral figures of the pharaohs, first attested in the Pyramid Texts. The mainstream position is: the Shemsu Hor were real Predynastic figures whose specific historical origins are unknown. The corridor hypothesis converges with this identification rather than competing with it. The question the mainstream leaves open—where the Horus cult at Hierakonpolis came from, and who these Predynastic figures were—is precisely the question this paper addresses. The model evaluated below represents the strongest logical form of the legitimation argument; it is not a position any major Egyptologist explicitly holds in this precise form, but its components are the objections a legitimation-minded reader would raise. Evaluated at its strongest, the model still fails on five counts.

The most coherent alternative to the migration hypothesis is the Structural Memory Model. Its argument is this: the Shemsu Hor category was constructed during Naqada III–Dynasty I state formation to legitimate the Horus dynasty by retrojecting its cult into a pre-dynastic ancestral past. Under this model, the tripartite king-list schema is a cross-cultural legitimation pattern; the archival specificity of Thutmose I and Dendera is standard legitimation rhetoric; and the Nuwayrat genome reflects long-term Neolithic population continuity rather than a discrete migration event. This model is coherent. It deserves serious treatment. It fails on five counts.

First, the model provides no mechanism for the westward directionality of the physical evidence. The corridor's western origin is not a textual claim but an evidential one — the west-to-east genetic and isotopic signal of Papers I and II, with the Canopus sky-gradient of Paper II as geometric context. Standard Egyptian legitimation frameworks—solar theology, the Osiris myth, divine birth, the dual crowns—point east, south, or to the celestial realm, and give no reason for a specifically western evidential signal. The migration model explains it directly; the legitimation model, addressed to the texts, leaves it untouched.

Second, the model cannot account for the material evidence at HK6. The Bat cow goddess emblem, *Balanites aegyptiaca* offerings, livestock horn modification practices (Van Neer et al. 2024), and morphological diversity at Hierakonpolis are physical facts. They are not textual constructs. They precede the state-building period the Structural Memory Model invokes as its origin point. Legitimation rhetoric is produced after state formation. These markers appear at HK6 before it.

Third, the model requires Egyptian scribes to specifically claim the existence of recoverable archival objects—written annals, leather rolls, architectural plans—as part of a legitimation strategy. This is an unusual claim. Generic legitimation rhetoric invokes ancestral authority in general terms. It does not typically claim that specific documents from that ancestral period can be found and consulted. The functional specificity of the Shemsu Hor archival references requires either that such documents existed, or that scribes were fabricating a specific archival claim. Both possibilities carry historical implications.

Fourth, the model treats the convergence of six independent evidence lines—textual, astronomical, archaeological, genetic, paleohydrological, and structural—on the same 700-year window as coincidence. The migration model explains this convergence through a single historical process. Occam's razor favours the explanation requiring fewer independent coincidences.

Fifth, the most recently published genomic evidence falls outside the Structural Memory Model's predictive scope. The Salem et al. (2025) finding—a genetically isolated, coherent North African Neolithic lineage at Takarkori, distributed across the AHP-era Fezzan corridor—is precisely the kind of bounded source population the migration model requires. The Structural Memory Model, which posits internal legitimation dynamics, has no framework for predicting or explaining this finding. The corridor migration hypothesis predicted this type of source population signal and provides a direct account of its downstream implications.

One clarification on the relationship between these models: they are not mutually exclusive. Both can be true simultaneously. Corridor migration could have occurred AND the Shemsu Hor category could have been formalized and amplified by later Egyptian state institutions for legitimation purposes. Every real historical memory receives institutional elaboration over time. The Hebrew Bible preserves genuine Bronze Age geography while also serving theological purposes. The *Iliad* preserves a real war while also serving political functions. The question is not whether the Shemsu Hor tradition was elaborated—of course it was, across 3,000 years. The question is whether there is a real historical

population at its base. The HK6 material evidence, the genomic endpoints, and the non-optional king-list slot all point to yes. The corridor hypothesis identifies who those real figures were and where they came from. The legitimation tradition preserved and amplified that memory. These are sequential layers of the same history, not competing explanations.

One further alternative requires direct engagement, raised by several reviewers: the Egyptian Western Desert model. Under this reading, the relevant migration was not from the far western Sahara via the Fezzan corridor but from the Egyptian Sahara itself—Nabta Playa, Dakhla, and Kharga, all documented pastoralist occupation zones that aridified and pushed populations eastward toward the Nile. This alternative accounts for the HK6 material markers (cattle culture, horn modification, *Balanites* offerings are all attested at Nabta Playa), the Canopus gradient (Nabta Playa is at 22.5°N, within the Canopus-visible zone), and basic Saharan-to-Nile population movement. It is more parsimonious in geographic terms and is consistent with established Egyptian archaeology.

What the Nabta Playa Model Explains:

Evidence Line	Nabta Playa Model
HK6 material markers	Yes—cattle cult, horn modification, *Balanites* all attested at Nabta
Canopus gradient	Partial—Nabta at 22.5°N sees Canopus at ~8–10° during its Late and Terminal Neolithic occupation, but does not explain why the orientation tradition persists for 2,000 years
Shemsu Hor textual tradition	No—Nabta Playa has no textual tradition linking it to the Shemsu Hor category
Genetic endpoints	No—the Nuwayrat genome's Moroccan Neolithic ancestry is not explained by Nabta Playa populations
Edfu Building Texts	Neutral—the Edfu records give no location for the homeland (Reymond 1969: 261), so they favour neither model
Archival specificity	No—Nabta Playa has no documented tradition of archives or written records

Where the Nabta Playa model fails most decisively is on the genetic evidence. Morez Jacobs et al. (2025) model the Nuwayrat genome's dominant ancestry component as best-fitted by Moroccan Neolithic reference populations among all North African and West Asian Neolithic sources tested—representing a deep North African Neolithic lineage documented continuously from Morocco through the Takarkori site in Libya along the proposed corridor route, thousands of kilometres west of the Egyptian Western Desert. Salem et al. (2025) document this lineage at Takarkori, a corridor-zone site in the Fezzan. The Nabta Playa model cannot explain why a Nile Valley Old Kingdom genome shows affinity to Moroccan Neolithic populations unless those populations moved along the corridor route that passes through Libya (Takarkori) and into Egypt. Nabta Playa is geographically closer to the Nile, but its population's genetic signature is unknown—and the corridor model's prediction is that it would match the Takarkori lineage if sampled, which would *support* the corridor model rather than replace it.

The decisive test between these models is Prediction 7a (Richat geochemistry) and Prediction 2 (elite aDNA). Until those tests are run, both models remain candidates, but the corridor model currently accounts for more of the evidence. The Nabta Playa model and the corridor model are not mutually exclusive: the corridor route passes within the geographic range of the Egyptian Western Desert oasis network, and Nabta Playa is not excluded—it is a potential corridor waypoint. What the Nabta Playa model cannot explain as a competing source is anything west of its own location: the Richat's distinctive geochemistry (Prediction 7a), the Moroccan Neolithic ancestry signal at Nuwayrat, and the

Takarkori lineage in the Fezzan—none of these can originate at a site within Egypt's own western desert.

Two common objections to the migration model also require direct response. The 'transmission gap' objection notes that the migration window ends ca. 3100 BCE, but the earliest stone inscription of the Pyramid Texts dates to ca. 2400 BCE—a 700-year interval. This gap is resolved by the established Egyptological consensus that the Pyramid Texts preserve oral tradition originating in the Predynastic period—before approximately 3100 BCE—transmitted by specialist lector priests before stone inscription. As Allen (2005: 7–10) notes, the language contains "many archaic features" and "some spells may date to the Predynastic period." The archaic language of the Cannibal Hymn (PT 273–274) strongly supports a Predynastic composition date (Faulkner 1969: 79–81). The entire migration window was preliterate; the earliest Egyptian hieroglyphs appear at Tomb U-j (c. 3320–3150 BCE) and were administrative. The gap between event and inscription is the gap between oral tradition and a literate state bureaucracy.

The “cosmological west” objection holds that Egyptian tradition places origins in the west as a solar-cycle convention. This is accurate for a specific set of Egyptian concepts: Amenti, Duat, the realm of the dead — the direction of the setting sun and the necropolis, expressed in Osiris’s epithet Khenti-Amentiu (“Foremost of the Westerners”; Allen 2015: 355), a god already named on 1st Dynasty royal necropolis sealings from Abydos beside Narmer and Hor-Aha (Petrie Museum UC36981). This tradition produces ritual directional language — “the deceased goes to the west,” “Amentet receives the dead” — not a geographic account of where a population physically originated.

That distinction is what answers the objection. The corridor model’s “west” is not the cosmological direction of the dead; it is a physical geographic origin, argued in Papers I and II from the Tehenu (the documented western Libyan population), the Richat Structure, and the genetic and isotopic evidence — not from Egyptian west-symbolism. The two “wests” belong to different orders: one a ritual invocation of the realm of the dead, the other an evidence-based claim about a homeland. The objection, which assumes the corridor’s west is merely borrowed cosmological convention, does not reach the argument.

The corridor hypothesis adds one further observation. For a population whose Saharan homeland became uninhabitable as the African Humid Period ended, the Egyptian theological west — the direction of endings and of the dead — would resonate with a remembered geographic reality: a homeland that lay to the west and that had, in a literal sense, died. The corridor model does not need the temple texts to state this, and they do not: the Edfu records give no location for the homeland (Reymond 1969: 261); it notes only that the evidence-based western origin and the cosmological west are mutually consistent rather than in tension.

13. Why Alternative Explanations Fall Short

The following table evaluates the four main alternative frameworks against all six evidence lines. The diagnostic criterion is not whether any alternative can account for one or two lines—most can. The criterion is whether any alternative provides a unifying explanation for all six lines simultaneously.

Note on scope: Two of the six lines—the genetic endpoints (Papers I and II) and the highland corridor (Paper I)—are established findings summarised here. Challenges to those lines belong with the papers that establish them. Paper III's four primary lines are textual tradition, archaeological package, astronomical orientations, and structural chronological convergence.

A critical note on the nature of the argument. Convergence across multiple independent evidence lines establishes consilience—the condition in which one explanatory framework is more parsimonious than all alternatives. It does not establish causation. The migration model's explanatory advantage over every alternative is that it accounts for all six lines with a single historical process, where each alternative requires independent mechanisms per unexplained line. That comparative parsimony is the argument for treating the decisive tests as high priority. It is not a substitute for those tests. The language throughout this section is "accounts for," "is consistent with," and "is the most parsimonious explanation." Not "demonstrates" or "proves." Demonstration is what Predictions 1, 2, 7, and 8 are for.

Evidence	Trade / Diffusion	Independent Development	Climate Alone	Migration Model
Genetics: North African Neolithic lineage at both corridor endpoints	Cannot move DNA	Shared lineage cannot emerge independently	Climate does not move genes	Parsimonious: same deep ancestry pool, corridor route, 2,000-year interval
Archaeology: Full Saharan cultural package at HK6	Could explain isolated traits; not the coherent package appearing simultaneously	Package of five independent markers appearing together unlikely by chance	Does not explain the cultural package	Parsimonious: people carrying their complete traditions intact
Paleohydrology: Corridor documented	Corridor is a physical finding shared by all models	Corridor is a physical finding shared by all models	Corridor is a physical finding shared by all models	Explains why the corridor was used: AHP collapse forced eastward movement
Astronomy: Canopus gradient + a Canopus orientation family of thirteen temples within 1.1° of the star's declination (survey tables)	Cannot explain either the gradient or the family's two-thousand-year span	Cannot explain either the gradient or the family's two-thousand-year span	Climate does not produce astronomical orientation traditions	Consistent: a population carrying a Canopus/Osiris tradition northward; not tested against the survey
Textual: Shemsu Hor archival specificity, 15 centuries, western directionality	Texts are not traded as a unit; western directionality unexplained by diffusion	Independent production of the same specific narrative by two priestly traditions is improbable	Climate alone does not produce textual traditions	Parsimonious: real ancestral generation left real records; western origin explains western directionality
Structural: Three independent chronologies converge on 3100 BCE	Cannot explain the three-way convergence	Three-way convergence by independent processes is improbable	Explains migration window but not the Shemsu Hor slot or the moment of unification	Parsimonious: single historical process produces all three terminations simultaneously

The Sustained Network Model

A fifth alternative deserves explicit evaluation: sustained multi-generational Saharan cultural network—continuous exchange of cultural and possibly genetic material across the Green Sahara throughout the African Humid Period, without a discrete migration event. This model is geographically plausible and consistent with established Saharan archaeology. It fails on three counts specific to this hypothesis.

First, the Lipson et al. (2025) eastern Maghreb barrier applies: Lipson et al. (2025) document high continuity of local forager ancestry in the eastern Maghreb from the Iberomaurusian into the Neolithic, with only small contributions from European farmers and Levantine groups — a population taking in little from outside. Sustained gradual exchange from Morocco to Egypt would have had to pass through it, which that continuity makes difficult though it does not rule out.

Second, the Nuwayrat genome's dominant North African Neolithic ancestry proportion (77.6%) argues for a discrete high-ancestry event rather than dilution by continuous exchange with contemporaneous Nile Valley populations. Gradual sustained exchange should produce a lower, more diluted ancestry proportion at Old Kingdom date.

Third, the HK6 cultural package appears abruptly at a single site in a compressed window, not as the gradual site-by-site adoption expected from a continuous exchange network. The sustained network model contextualizes the corridor hypothesis rather than replacing it: long-term AHP interaction is consistent with the migration hypothesis, but the specific evidentiary profile—ancestry proportion, abrupt HK6 package, genomic isolation of the eastern Maghreb—points toward a discrete movement event rather than a continuous diffusion process.

Cumulative Force

The force of this argument is cumulative. Each marker individually could have a local explanation, but the probability that all five appear together, at the same site, in the same window, without a common cause, is low. The full analysis of site-specificity, and of the cranial evidence — which is consistent with population movement without establishing it — is in Section 5.

Each alternative explains one or two lines but requires multiple independent ad hoc mechanisms to address the others. The migration model proposes a primary structuring process within a multi-causal system: climate forcing (AHP collapse) generated corridor migration, which produced the genetic and archaeological signatures at HK6, which contributed to the cultural foundation for the astronomical tradition preserved in 2,000 years of temple orientations, and was subsequently encoded in the textual memory of the Shemsu Hor.

This causal sequence—climate event → movement → integration → cultural synthesis → institutional memory—organizes all six evidence lines within a single historical framework, while not excluding additional local or independent developments. The distinction is that this model predicts their co-occurrence as structured outcomes of that process, whereas alternatives require independent mechanisms for each unexplained line.

That comparative parsimony is the argument. It does not constitute proof. Predictions 1, 2, 7, and 8 will provide the direct evidence that parsimony alone cannot.

Taken in its strongest form, the non-migration framework accounts for individual components of the dataset—particularly local cultural development and internal political consolidation—but does so by treating the genetic, astronomical, textual, and archaeological patterns as independent or only loosely related phenomena. The present model differs in that it predicts their co-occurrence as structurally linked outcomes of a single historical process. The comparison therefore reduces to whether these features are better explained as independent convergences or as expressions of an integrated system generated by corridor migration.

14. Explicitly Acknowledged Limitations

The following limitations define the boundary conditions of this hypothesis. They do not invalidate the argument. They define where it ends.

Limitation	Clarification
No preserved reign lengths for Shemsu Hor	Turin Canon gives no individual durations. The category exists; its internal chronology does not.
Manetho's numbers are discarded	Used only to confirm the structural sequence; numerical totals pass through too many copyists to be treated as data.
Shemsu Hor as 'rulers' not confirmed	Texts emphasise ancestral, celestial, and archival roles—not explicit political kingship over a defined territory.
Specific ethnic identity cannot be claimed	The textual record identifies a category, not a people. The hypothesis offers a historical candidate; it does not name one.
Biological continuity ≠ cultural causation	Skeletal affinities are consistent with population movement without establishing it, and they do not independently confirm transmission of specific cultural elements attributed to the Shemsu Hor.
Pyramid Texts are ritual, not historical	All PT references place Shemsu Hor in purification and ascent contexts. They do not describe political rule or geographic origin.
Shemsu Hor = Akhu is structural, not explicit	Turin Canon lists them as Akhu. No text explicitly equates the categories—this remains interpretation based on structural alignment.
No text describes Shemsu Hor as a historical population	Their origin, migration, and governance are absent from all surviving sources.
Edfu Building Texts are Ptolemaic in current form	Compiled 2,000+ years after the events they describe, during a period of active archaization. They are a memory stream, not a contemporary record.
Genetic chain gap	The genomic evidence currently anchors both ends of the corridor: Takarkori (c. 5000 BCE, Fezzan) and Nuwayrat (c. 2700 BCE, Nile Valley). The Nuwayrat genome's 77.6% North African Neolithic ancestry is best-modelled by Moroccan Neolithic populations—a signal consistent with the corridor route. What is missing is aDNA from the corridor itself during the migration window (3800–3100 BCE) and from the Mauritanian source zone. Prediction 9 specifies exactly what

Limitation	Clarification
	evidence would close the gap.
Richat as specific source candidate	Paper I identified the Richat through systematic elimination of twenty alternative formations. It is the highest-priority candidate, not a demonstrated source. Prediction 7 tests it directly. The Wedjat calculation uses Richat coordinates because that is Paper I's published result.
Canopus pattern not uniquely explained by migration	Temple orientations combine astronomy, topography, cardinal directions, and local traditions. The Belmonte/Shaltout team identified seven orientation families, not one. The migration model provides the most parsimonious unifying historical framework for the Canopus family specifically; it is not the only conceivable explanation.
Single-process parsimony compresses a complex reality	Predynastic state formation almost certainly involved multiple processes: local Upper Egyptian competition, Nubian peer-culture interaction, Levantine trade networks, and climate-driven movements. The corridor hypothesis provides one mechanism accounting for a coherent set of anomalies. It does not claim to account for every aspect of Egyptian origins.

PART VI: FALSIFICATIONS, PREDICTIONS AND EVALUATION

A hypothesis that cannot be evaluated against alternatives and tested against predictions is not science. The Shemsu Hor Hypothesis produces ten falsifiable predictions. Prediction 6 has been tested against the published survey record: 6b is not supported, 6c is supported only in part, and 6a cannot yet be judged. Predictions 1, 2, 7, and 8 are the decisive tests.

Epistemic Status of the Consilience Claim

Six lines of evidence—spanning physical geography, genetics, archaeology, archaeoastronomy, textual analysis, and structural chronology—converge consistently with the corridor migration model. Two of these lines share a terminal boundary: the textual Shemsu Hor category and the archaeological state-formation threshold both describe the opening of legible Egyptian history at 3100 BCE. They are two descriptions of one event, not two independent chronologies. The genuinely independent convergences are the climate record, the genetic endpoints, the astronomical survey data, and the structural content of the textual tradition (the Shemsu Hor king-list category). The Wedjat framework (Sections 1–2) is not counted among the six primary evidence lines: as a mechanism argument, it addresses how cultural continuity was maintained, not whether the migration occurred. Its documented numerical correspondence between the construction protocol and the Wedjat sequence (Sections 1 and 2) is a verifiable fact in published sources, but is assessed separately.

This convergence is not offered as proof. It is offered as consilience: the corridor model currently provides the most parsimonious integrated account of all six lines without requiring independent ad hoc mechanisms for each—though this assessment is subject to revision as alternative models are more fully developed. Each alternative explanation evaluated below handles one or two lines and requires separate explanatory mechanisms for the rest. The migration model handles all six with a single historical process.

That comparative parsimony is not demonstration. It is the argument that the decisive tests are worth running. Predictions 1, 2, 7, and 8 will determine whether the consilience reflects a real historical event or a coincidence of independent processes. Until those results are in, "convergent" and "consistent with" are the correct framings. "Demonstrated" is not.

Prediction	What Would Support It	What Would Falsify It
1. Isotope gradients in Predynastic elites	Non-local strontium / oxygen signatures in HK6 and Naqada II–III elite burials consistent with western Saharan origins. *Methodological note:* No strontium or oxygen isotope study of Predynastic Hierakonpolis remains has been published. This criterion is therefore stated as an unperformed test rather than as one returning a result, and no isotopic finding, supporting or opposing, is claimed here. The method itself is established for prehistoric populations in northeastern Africa: Capasso et al. (2026) report strontium isotope ratios across five cultural phases in Eastern Sudan, from the later fifth millennium BCE to the first millennium CE, and identify non-local adults in proportions that shift with period — five of six in the Malawiya sample, four of seven in the late fourth-millennium Butana group, seven of thirty-nine in the Gash group. Their mobile individuals are referred to the Eastern Desert and the Nile Valley rather than to the western Sahara, so that study bears on this prediction as a demonstration of method, and as a parallel case of aridification displacing populations toward a shelter region, not as support for a western origin.	Null findings specifically in early Predynastic elite contexts—Tasian, Badarian, early Naqada I—would constitute genuine negative pressure on the hypothesis, even without complete absence across all contexts. The falsification condition is not total absence; it is absence in the earliest, least-assimilated elite window.
2. Western aDNA signatures	aDNA from Naqada II–III elite contexts showing elevated North/West African Neolithic ancestry relative to contemporaneous non-elite individuals or earlier Nile Valley populations	aDNA continuity with no detectable western admixture across the Predynastic transition in any cemetery class
3. Technological discontinuity	Hard-stone vessel types appearing in Naqada II elite contexts that cannot be sourced to documented Egyptian quarries through chemical analysis—specifically igneous and volcanic lithologies absent from the Eastern Desert quarry inventory. Quarry sourcing methodology follows Mallory-Greenough et al. (1999) and Aston (1994).	All Naqada II hard-stone vessel types successfully sourced to documented Egyptian quarries through chemical analysis
3b. Site-specificity comparison (Naqada)	The five Saharan pastoral markers documented at Hierakonpolis (dung fuel use, Balanites offerings, horn modification and the Bat cow goddess emblem, all at HK6, with the cranial sample at site level) will be significantly weaker in frequency or absent at contemporaneous Naqada Cemetery T and B elite burials. The corridor hypothesis predicts site-specificity: integration at the Horus cult center (Hierakonpolis/Nekhen), not at the rival Seth cult center (Naqada/Nubt).	Those markers appearing at equivalent or higher frequency at Naqada Cemetery T and B relative to Hierakonpolis
4. Falcon cult origin	Horus falcon iconography traceable to western Saharan or Nubian A-Group contexts before its appearance in Upper Egyptian elite contexts	Falcon cult demonstrably originating within the Nile Valley with no

Prediction	What Would Support It	What Would Falsify It
		western or southern antecedents
5. Archival references	Discovery of material predating Dynasty I corresponding to the 'annals' and 'leather documents' referenced by Thutmose I and the Dendera builders	Demonstration that all such references are retrospective literary invention with no archival basis whatsoever
6a. Cardinal family frequency ordering	The cardinal super-family (Families I, VI, VII) is the most frequent orientation group in the Belmonte dataset, solar families less frequent, stellar families least frequent—decreasing accessibility predicts decreasing frequency. Cannot yet be judged; needs the temple-by-temple list (Belmonte, Shaltout and Fekri 2009, Appendix II). The 2008 histogram peak heights are broadly in this order but are not frequencies.	Cardinal super-family less frequent than solar families in the published dataset
6b. Canopus frequency gradient [NOT SUPPORTED BY PUBLISHED DATA]	Canopus orientation frequency declines continuously and proportionally to the star's altitude at each latitude. The Sudanese temples, where the star stood highest, show no Canopus peak (Belmonte et al. 2010); Lower Egypt shows none; the family appears in the oases and deserts.	No correlation between Canopus altitude and Canopus orientation frequency across the full dataset
6c. Non-observable Canopus persistence [PARTLY SUPPORTED BY PUBLISHED DATA]	Canopus-oriented temples exist at sites and periods where Canopus was below practical naked-eye altitude, indicating transmitted institutional memory rather than direct observation. Result: the northernmost Canopus-family temples stand where the star was about 6° high (none lower than 5.9°), low but detectable on a clear night. This was the hardest and most specific test of the Wedjat-hierarchy framework and the published tables support it only in part.	All Canopus-oriented temples located where the star was functionally observable; no orientations to Canopus at genuinely non-observable altitudes
7. Stone vessel geochemistry	Predynastic hard-stone vessels (Naqada II–III) sourced to western Saharan lithologies (iron-stained rhyolite, black gabbro, red-weathering carbonatite, Matton & Jébrak 2014: 113; Taylor & Giles 2015: 27; REE patterns; Nb/Ta ratios 26–48) consistent with Richat Structure geology. *Reinforcing note:* Egypt possesses no documented primary magmatic carbonatite complex replicating the Richat's distinctive combination of carbonatite host rock, elevated transition metals and LREE mineral suite. Whole-rock major- and trace-element and C–O isotope data for the Richat carbonatites are reported by Sedigh et al. (2024); specific transition-metal concentrations are not restated here pending direct comparison against that dataset. The closest Egyptian analogue—the Late Cretaceous Abu Khruq alkaline ring complex in the South Eastern Desert—features secondary hydrothermal carbonatization rather than primary	All Predynastic stone vessel raw materials match Egyptian quarry sources, with no western Saharan lithological signatures across systematic testing

Prediction	What Would Support It	What Would Falsify It
	carbonatite intrusions; its syenogabbros contain <20 ppm Ni and negligible Cr (Obeid and Lalonde 2013). Abu Khruq exhibits localized LREE enrichment in altered zones and accessory phases including monazite and pyrochlore (El Afandy et al. 2013) but does not appear in any published survey of ancient Egyptian quarries spanning the Late Predynastic through Roman periods (Harrell and Storemyr 2009). If vessel testing returns a carbonatite-hosted signature with elevated Ni/Cr and the Richat's LREE pattern, no known local Egyptian source can account for it. While future surveys could identify additional Egyptian sources, current data show no match for this specific combination.	
8. A-Group aDNA	aDNA from Nubian A-Group individuals (ca. 3800–3100 BCE) showing elevated affinity to the Takarkori North African Neolithic lineage (Salem et al. 2025), consistent with a shared source population at both ends of the corridor	A-Group aDNA showing no affinity to the Takarkori lineage; ancestry profile matching local Nile Valley Epipaleolithic populations exclusively
9. Corridor archaeology	Evidence of human activity along the northeast highland corridor (ca. 5000–3100 BCE): campsites, lithic scatters, or skeletal remains consistent with pastoralist movement through the documented stepping-stone refugia network of plateau and massif sites (Tassili n'Ajjer, Takarkori / Tadrart Acacus, Messak Settafet, Gilf Kebir), with the Fezzan–Kufra paleochannels as a possible supplementary eastern segment (Drake et al. 2011; Paillou et al. 2009; Klokočník et al. 2017). This is the critical gap in the current evidence: the genetic chain has two documented anchor points (Takarkori and Nuwayrat) but no intermediate samples from the corridor during the migration window itself, and the western source-zone in Mauritania remains entirely unsampled.	Systematic corridor survey revealing no human activity along the highland refugia network during the proposed migration window
10. Richat uniqueness	The Richat Structure satisfies all six conditions derived from the Wedjat binary fractions, Belmonte's rotations, the Canopus gradient, Green Sahara occupation, the highland corridor, and the Shemsu Hor textual tradition.	A global survey of concentric-ring structures and Green Sahara sites identifies another location that satisfies all six conditions; or higher-resolution mapping shows the 1/64 point falls outside the Richat's main concentric system.

An Anchor Point for Predictions 1 and 2: The Nuwayrat Whole-Genome

Morez Jacobs et al. (2025) published the first whole-genome sequence of an ancient Egyptian—NUE001, Nuwayrat, 2855–2570 BCE—showing 77.6% North African Neolithic ancestry best-modelled by Moroccan Neolithic populations (Skhirat-Rouazi), the best-fitting of all North African and West Asian Neolithic sources in the rotating model competition, with the remainder (~20%) best modelled as eastern Fertile Crescent ancestry. His oxygen and strontium isotope results are “consistent with having grown up” in the Nile Valley (Morez Jacobs et al. 2025). The technical tools and analytical methods needed to test Predictions 1 and 2 demonstrably exist and produce clean, interpretable results. What is currently missing is sampling of Predynastic elite contexts. Stevenson (2016), in the most comprehensive recent review of Predynastic state formation, identified this exact gap: 'analysis of the genome from human remains in Predynastic cemeteries might provide good evidence of population movements in the 4th millennium BC' (Stevenson 2016: footnote 90). This paper proposes the test that the field's own reviewers have independently identified as the critical missing piece.

What the Fertile Crescent component does and does not imply: The ~20% eastern ancestry at Nuwayrat is compatible with, not contradictory to, corridor migration. The Takarkori lineage is related to the Taforalt ancestry, which already carries a Natufian-related, Levantine component (van de Loosdrecht et al. 2018; Salem et al. 2025), so a limited Levantine-related signal could already be present through pre-existing north-south gene flow across the Sahara during the African Humid Period, when green corridors connected the Mediterranean coast to sub-Saharan Africa. Alternatively, the eastern component could reflect later admixture following state consolidation, when Egypt's documented trade relations with the Levant and Mesopotamia (Section 9) intensified. Neither scenario requires abandoning the North African Neolithic ancestry signal as the dominant component.

Why diffusion alone is insufficient: A pure diffusion model without directed migration would require the North African Neolithic ancestry signal to travel from Morocco to the Nile Valley through the eastern Maghreb populations in which Lipson et al. (2025) document high continuity of local forager ancestry and little incoming admixture. The corridor model resolves this paradox by proposing a discrete movement event along the documented highland refugia network — the stepping-stone corridor of plateau and massif sites that Paper I establishes as the primary migration route, with the Fezzan–Kufra paleochannels as a supplementary eastern segment — bypassing the non-transmitting eastern Maghreb populations entirely. The 77.6% ancestry proportion at Nuwayrat argues for a substantial migration event rather than gradual dilution through continuous exchange — sustained diffusion should produce a lower, more diluted proportion at Old Kingdom date.

One acknowledged gap in the current genomic evidence must be stated directly. The genetic chain as documented consists of two anchor points: a corridor-zone population at Takarkori (~5000 BCE, Fezzan, southwestern Libya—a midpoint on the proposed route, not the Mauritanian source zone) and a destination genome at Nuwayrat (~2700 BCE), separated by approximately 2,300 years and the full length of the corridor. No ancient DNA from the Fezzan corridor itself during the proposed migration window (3800–3100 BCE) has been published, and the western source-zone anchor in Mauritania remains entirely unsampled. These are the field's most important open questions for testing this hypothesis, addressed directly by Prediction 9. The gap does not invalidate the genetic argument—the anchor points establish the North African Neolithic ancestry pool at a documented corridor site and at

the Nile destination, and the climate and archaeological evidence independently establishes the migration pressure and timing—but closing it with intermediate corridor samples and a Mauritanian source-zone sample would transform the genomic case from circumstantially consistent to directly documented.

A further constraint follows from this model. If populations along the proposed corridor show continuity with Nile Valley populations but not with western Saharan populations, the hypothesis would require revision toward cultural transmission rather than primary migration. Conversely, continuity linking western Saharan, corridor, and Nile populations would support a demic component to the process.

Relationship to the Internal Aggregation Model

The internal competition and aggregation model—Thinis, Naqada, and Nekhen as rival Upper Egyptian polities with Thinis ultimately dominant—is well established and explains the political mechanism of unification. It does not address the population composition of those polities or why the first Old Kingdom whole genome shows dominant North African Neolithic ancestry rather than a profile consistent with indigenous Nile Valley Epipaleolithic populations. The two frameworks are not mutually exclusive. Internal aggregation describes the political mechanism. Saharan corridor migration explains the longer-term demographic and cultural context in which that mechanism operated.

Relationship to Mainstream Interpretations

Mainstream Egyptology identifies the Shemsu Hor with the Souls of Pe and Nekhen—ancestral protectors of the kings of Upper and Lower Egypt, first attested in the Pyramid Texts (Sethe 1905; Frankfort 1978). This identification is not contested here. The hypothesis converges with it: if the Horus falcon cult at Hierakonpolis has western Saharan roots, its first political instantiation occurs at Nekhen—precisely the site the hypothesis predicts for elite Saharan migrant consolidation. The Hertz (1931) identification of the Shemsu Hor with predynastic rulers of Lower Egypt, and the dual Pe/Buto + Nekhen/Hierakonpolis character of the tradition, are both consistent with the textual record and with the hypothesis advanced here.

A related question concerns the Naqada polity—a major Predynastic center alongside Hierakonpolis. The corridor hypothesis does not predict Naqada as a second corridor integration point. Naqada was associated with the Seth cult, not the Horus cult; it was the rival polity subsequently conquered by the Hierakonpolis–Abydos alliance that carried the Horus tradition to unification (Kemp 2006; Wilkinson 1999). The corridor hypothesis predicts integration specifically at the Horus cult center. Naqada's Seth association and its conquest by the corridor-derived Horus tradition is consistent with the model, not a gap in it: the corridor populations integrated at Hierakonpolis; their tradition subsequently absorbed its rival.

A gap in the comparison deserves acknowledgment: no published systematic comparison of the five Hierakonpolis markers with contemporaneous Naqada cemeteries (Cemeteries T and B) has been conducted. The corridor hypothesis predicts the Saharan pastoral package will be significantly weaker or absent at Naqada's Seth cult cemeteries relative to the Horus cult center—a testable prediction from the site-specificity argument that awaits systematic evaluation.

Conclusion

The Shemsu Hor Hypothesis makes a bounded and specific claim: the transitional category preserved across fifteen centuries of independent Egyptian sources—the Followers of Horus—is not mythological invention. It is cultural memory encoding a real historical horizon: the arrival and consolidation of populations in the Nile Valley during the collapse of the African Humid Period (ca. 3800–3100 BCE).

Paper I established the physical case. Paper II traced the genetic and symbolic trail. Paper III has demonstrated that the Egyptian textual record—read carefully and without overclaiming—is consistent with exactly the historical process those two papers document. The three papers carry distinct evidential responsibilities: Paper I answers whether a geologically distinctive candidate source existed and how to test it; Paper II answers whether the genetic and symbolic record is consistent with migration along that corridor; Paper III answers whether Egypt's own historical memory is consistent with what those two papers find. A reviewer who accepts Papers I and II but challenges Paper III's textual argument is engaging the hypothesis correctly. A reviewer who challenges the Richat candidate or the qpAdm modelling inside Paper III is challenging the wrong paper.

The tripartite king-list slot is real and non-optional. The archival specificity that increases over fifteen centuries is anomalous for invented mythological categories. The five material markers at Hierakonpolis appear together at the right site at the right time. The Canopus family of temple orientations is documented by independent researchers who leave its full significance an open question. The chronological convergence at 3100 BCE is produced by one genuinely independent chronology—the climate record—meeting one defined historical boundary, with the textual tradition contributing independent geographic and narrative content rather than an independent date.

The decisive tests are clear. Isotopic analysis of early Predynastic elite burials. Ancient DNA from Naqada II–III elite contexts and A-Group Nubian individuals. Geochemical sourcing of hard-stone vessels against western Saharan lithologies. These tests target materials in existing museum collections using methods that demonstrably work. None of them has been run systematically. If they fail, the migration model weakens substantially while the structural Shemsu Hor insight survives.

If the remaining tests succeed, the hypothesis moves from the most parsimonious available explanation to direct evidentiary support.

One critical limitation must be re-stated here with the same weight it receives in Prediction 9: the genomic argument currently rests on two documented endpoints separated by approximately 2,300 years and thousands of kilometres, with no published ancient DNA from the Fezzan corridor itself during the proposed migration window (3800–3100 BCE). The corridor is a documented physical and paleoclimatic feature; the human population chain through it remains the series' most critical open empirical question. Prediction 9 targets that gap directly.

Egyptian tradition preserves a structured memory of pre-dynastic ancestral groups. This memory aligns temporally and structurally with the archaeologically attested period of population movement, elite formation, and state consolidation in the Nile Valley. The Shemsu Hor may encode a real historical transition—the moment when one world ended and another began. Saharan corridor migration is among the most coherent candidates yet proposed for what that transition was.

The Shemsu Hor period ends at approximately 3100 BCE. The structures that most consistently prompt the question 'what knowledge is encoded here?' were built roughly 500 years later. At a generation of 25 years, that is roughly twenty generations—approximately the same temporal distance as separates us today from the mid-16th century, a period well within the range of continuous institutional memory, archival transmission, and ritual continuity. The Shemsu Hor were not mythological ancestors from an unimaginably distant past. They were the documented institutional predecessors of the engineers who built the Old Kingdom's monuments—separated by a genealogically traceable lineage, not by a mythological gulf. The knowledge had not faded. It had been institutionalised, refined, and was now, for the first time, backed by the organisational power of a unified state. That question—what did this generation's accumulated knowledge ultimately build—is addressed in subsequent work in this series.

Speculative Epilogue: The Destination

The Shemsu Hor walked from the west. The corridor gave them water, disease, and generations of adaptation. The Wedjat encoded the path—the concentric rings of home, the teardrop wadi, the star that sank as they moved north. The plateau at the bend of the Nile was the last reliable water. It was also something more: a landmark that had already stood for generations, a fixed point in a changing world.

The plateau rises from the floodplain, visible from kilometers away, elevated, stable, and distinct. To a people who had spent millennia in a connected Sahara, it was not unknown. It was the remembered edge of their world.

The plateau offered them something. The limestone had been carved by wind and water into a form that already suggested the guardian — a recumbent mass, facing east, elevated above the floodplain. Those who passed through may have finished what the desert had begun: shaping the natural formation into something intentional, a recumbent lion facing the sunrise, guardian of the eastern horizon they were moving toward. They did not stay. They continued north, toward Buto, toward the Delta, toward the unification that was still centuries away. The Wedjat — the two eyes, east and west, sun and moon — already encoded its geometry. They carried that memory northward. The monument remained where they had left it. It still does.

The Shemsu Hor period ends around 3100 BCE. The unification that followed gave them something they had not had before: the organization to build not just for the living, but for the dead and for the generations yet to come. They looked at the plateau, at the ancient figure their passage had left behind — the Great Sphinx of Giza — at the star that had guided those ancestors and was now lost below the horizon. And they decided to build something that would not fade.

They built for permanence. They built for memory. They built so that no one who came after would forget where they came from—and that is the subject of the next paper: **The Pyramid as A Memory...**

Next Steps

Priority	Action	Purpose
1	Commission isotope mapping of early Predynastic elite burials (Tasian, Badarian, early	Test Prediction 1 in the window before isotopic assimilation would erase the

Priority	Action	Purpose
	Naqada I contexts)	Saharan signal
2	Commission aDNA from HK6 elite cemetery and A-Group Nubian contexts	Test Predictions 2 and 8: western admixture and Takarkori lineage affinity
3	Geochemical sourcing of Naqada II hard-stone vessels against western Saharan lithologies	Test Prediction 7: match or eliminate Richat Structure carbonatite signature
4	Systematic corridor archaeology along the highland refugia network — the stepping-stone plateau and massif sites (Tassili, Takarkori, Messak, Gilf Kebir) that form the backbone of Paper I's Highland Corridor model (Drake et al. 2011; Paillou et al. 2009)	Test Prediction 9: close the genetic chain gap with intermediate corridor evidence
5	Map Qustul and Dynasty 0 falcon iconography against western Saharan rock art corpus	Test Prediction 4: western antecedents for the falcon cult
6	Test Prediction 6a against the temple-by-temple list (Belmonte, Shaltout and Fekri 2009, Appendix II); 6b and 6c are not supported by the survey papers read so far	Test whether Canopus orientation tradition predates the known temple-building record
7	Pull full primary inscription texts for Shemsu Hor references from Egyptological databases	Expand the textual evidence base with direct citations beyond those documented here

References

Archaeoastronomy and Stellar Studies

Allen, R. H. (1899). Star-Names and Their Meanings. New York: G. E. Stechert. (Reprinted 1963 as Star Names: Their Lore and Meaning, Dover.)

Belmonte, J. A. (2001). On the orientation of Old Kingdom Egyptian pyramids. *Archaeoastronomy*, no. 26 (supplement to Journal for the History of Astronomy 32), S1–S20.

Belmonte, J. A. (2011). The Egyptian calendar and its astronomical background. In *Proceedings of the International Astronomical Union*, 7(S278), 75–84.

Belmonte, J. A., Fekri, M., Abdel-Hadi, Y. A., Shaltout, M., & González-García, A. C. (2010). On the orientation of ancient Egyptian temples: (5) Testing the theory in Middle Egypt and Sudan. *Journal for the History of Astronomy*, 41(1), 65–93. DOI: 10.1177/002182861004100103.

Belmonte, J. A., Shaltout, M., & Fekri, M. (2008). On the orientation of ancient Egyptian temples: (4) Epilogue in Serabit el Khadim and overview. *Journal for the History of Astronomy*, 39, 181–211. DOI: 10.1177/002182860803900203.

Belmonte, J.A. & Shaltout, M. (2010). Keeping Ma'at: an astronomical approach to the orientation of the temples in ancient Egypt. Advances in Space Research 46(4): 532–539.

Belmonte, J.A., Pérez Die, M.C. & Díaz-Iglesias Llanos, L. (2016). Shrines of ram-headed divinities and Canopus: skyscaping at Herakleopolis Magna. Mediterranean Archaeology and Archaeometry 16(4): 125–132. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.220911.

Belmonte, J.A., Shaltout, M. & Fekri, M. (2009). Astronomy, landscape and symbolism: a study of the orientation of ancient Egyptian temples. In J.A. Belmonte & M. Shaltout (eds), In Search of Cosmic Order: Selected Essays on Egyptian Archaeoastronomy, pp. 213–283. Cairo: Supreme Council of Antiquities Press.

Lockyer, N. (1894). *The Dawn of Astronomy*: A Study of the Temple Worship and Mythology of the Ancient Egyptians. London: Cassell. [Reprinted Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1964, and New York: Dover. Free full text at Project Gutenberg, ebook 64849. Lockyer's historical and mythological reconstructions were criticised by Egyptologists of his own time and much of that material is superseded; he is cited here only for his record of temple orientations.]

Malville, J. M., Schild, R., Wendorf, F., & Brenmer, R. (2008). Astronomy of Nabta Playa. In J.C. Holbrook, J.O. Urama & R.T. Medupe (eds.), African Cultural Astronomy: Current Archaeoastronomy and Ethnoastronomy Research in Africa (pp. 131–143). Dordrecht: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4020-6639-9_11.

Malville, J. M., Wendorf, F., Mazar, A. A., & Schild, R. (1998). Megaliths and Neolithic astronomy in southern Egypt. *Nature*, 392(6675), 488–491. DOI: 10.1038/33131.

Parker, R. A. (1950). *The Calendars of Ancient Egypt*. Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 26. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. xiii + 83 pp., 21 figures, 6 plates, 8 tables. [Freely available from the Institute for the Study of Ancient Cultures, University of Chicago.]

Priskin, G. (2015). The Dendera zodiacs as narratives of the myth of Osiris, Isis, and the child Horus. *Égypte Nilotique et Méditerranéenne*, 8, 133–185.

Priskin, G. (2016). The astral myth of Osiris: the decans of Taurus and Libra. *Égypte Nilotique et Méditerranéenne*, 9, 45–72.

Priskin, G. (2019). The constellations of the Egyptian astronomical diagrams. *Égypte Nilotique et Méditerranéenne*, 12, 137–180.

Schaefer, B.E. (1998). To the visual limits. Sky & Telescope 95(5): 57–60.

Shaltout, M., & Belmonte, J. A. (2005). On the orientation of ancient Egyptian temples: (1) Upper Egypt and Lower Nubia. *Journal for the History of Astronomy*, 36(3), 273–298.

Shaltout, M., Belmonte, J. A., & Fekri, M. (2007). On the orientation of ancient Egyptian temples: (3) Key points in Lower Egypt and Siwa Oasis. *Journal for the History of Astronomy*, 38, 141–160 (Part I) and 413–442 (Part II).

Archaeobotany and Paleoethnobotany

Fahmy, A. G., Friedman, R., & Fadl, M. (2008). Archaeobotanical studies at Hierakonpolis Locality HK6: The Pre- and Early Dynastic elite cemetery. *Archéo-Nil*, 18, 169–183. [Reports Ziziphus spina-christi and Balanites aegyptiaca among the offerings in the HK6 elite tombs.]

Marinova, E., Ryan, P., Van Neer, W., & Friedman, R. (2013). Animal dung from arid environments and archaeobotanical methodologies for its analysis: An example from animal burials of the Predynastic elite cemetery HK6 at Hierakonpolis, Egypt. *Environmental Archaeology*, 18(1), 58–71. DOI: 10.1179/1461410313Z.00000000020

Winchell, F., Stevens, C.J., Murphy, C., Champion, L. & Fuller, D.Q. (2017). Evidence for sorghum domestication in fourth millennium BC eastern Sudan: Spikelet morphology from ceramic impressions of the Butana Group. *Current Anthropology*, 58(5), 673–683. DOI: 10.1086/693898

Archaeology — Egypt and Nubia

Adams, W. Y. (1985). Doubts about the 'lost pharaohs'. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, 44(3), 185–192.

Badura, M., Paner, H., Lisman, D., et al. (2025). A mysterious burial from the Kerma Culture (second millennium BC) in the Bayuda Desert of Sudan. *Azania: Archaeological Research in Africa* (advance online publication).

Bianchi, R. S. (2004). *Daily Life of the Nubians*. The Greenwood Press "Daily Life Through History" Series (ISSN 1080-4749). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press. xx + 284 pp. ISBN 0-313-32501-4.

Breasted, J. H. (1931). The Predynastic Union of Egypt. *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale*, 30, 709–724. DOI: 10.3406/bifao.1931.1923. [With 2 plates. Free full text on Persée.]

Childe, V. G. (1934). *New Light on the Most Ancient East*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. [First edition; the work ran to a fourth edition, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1952.]

Dreyer, G. (1998). *Umm el-Qaab I: Das prädynastische Königsgrab U-j und seine frühen Schriftzeugnisse*. Archäologische Veröffentlichungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo, 86. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern.

Droux, X., Friedman, R., & Pieri, A. (2024). The elite predynastic cemetery at Hierakonpolis HK6: 2016–2018 progress report. In Y. Tristant, J. Villaeys & E. Ryan (Eds.), Egypt at its Origins 7: Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Predynastic and Early Dynastic Egypt. Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta. Leuven: Peeters.

Emery, W. B. (1961). *Archaic Egypt*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books. 269 pp. [Pelican Books A462. Reprinted repeatedly, including 1987; the author died in 1971, so later printings are reprints rather than revised editions.]

Friedman, R. F., & Adams, B. (Eds.) (1992). The Followers of Horus: Studies Dedicated to Michael Allen Hoffman 1944–1990. Egyptian Studies Association Publication 2 / Oxbow Monograph 20. Oxford: Oxbow Books.

Friedman, R. F., Van Neer, W., & Linseele, V. (2011). The elite Predynastic cemetery at Hierakonpolis: 2009–2010 update. In R. F. Friedman & P. N. Fiske (Eds.), *Egypt at its Origins 3*: Proceedings of the Third International Conference 'Origin of the State: Predynastic and Early Dynastic Egypt', London, 27 July – 1 August 2008 (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 205, pp. 157–191). Leuven: Peeters.

Friedman, R.F. (2009). Hierakonpolis Locality HK29A: The Predynastic ceremonial center revisited. Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt, 45, 79–103.

Gatto, M. C. (1997a). La cultura protostorica dei Gruppi-A in Bassa Nubia (Egitto, Sudan). *Archeologia Africana – Saggi Occasionali*, 3, 37–46.

Gatto, M. C. (2006). The Nubian A-Group: a reassessment. *Archéo-Nil*, 16, 61–76.

Gatto, M. C. (2021). The A-Group and 4th millennium BCE Nubia. In G. Emberling & B. B. Williams (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Nubia* (pp. 125–142). Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190496272.013.8.

Hall, H. R. (1924). The union of Egypt and the Old Kingdom. In J. B. Bury, S. A. Cook & F. E. Adcock (Eds.), The Cambridge Ancient History, Volume I: Egypt and Babylonia to 1580 B.C. (2nd ed., ch. VII, p. 265). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [Section I, 'Kingdoms of the north and south'.]

Hertz, Amélia. (1931). La Haute et la Basse-Egypte a la fin des temps prehistoriques. *Revue de l'Égypte ancienne*, 3 (1929–1931), 81–96. DOI: 10.11588/diglit.32868.12. Full scan, open access: https://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/revue_egypte_ancienne1929_1931/0078

Kemp, B. J. (2006). *Ancient Egypt: Anatomy of a Civilization* (2nd ed.). London and New York: Routledge. 437 pp. ISBN 978-0-415-23550-1. [First edition 1989; third edition 2018.]

Köhler, E. C. (2010). Theories of state formation. In W. Wendrich (Ed.), *Egyptian Archaeology* (pp. 36–54). Blackwell Studies in Global Archaeology. Chichester and Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell. ISBN 978-1-4051-4988-4.

Petrie, W. M. F. (1939). *The Making of Egypt*. Egyptian Research Account / British School of Archaeology in Egypt 61. London: The Sheldon Press. xv + 187 pp., 82 plates. [Free scan at archive.org/details/Petrie1939.]

Ryholt, K. S. B. (1997). *The Political Situation in Egypt during the Second Intermediate Period, c. 1800–1550 B.C.* Carsten Niebuhr Institute Publications 20. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press.

Shaw, I. (ed.) (2000). The Oxford History of Ancient Egypt. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stevenson, A. (2016). The Egyptian Predynastic and state formation. *Journal of Archaeological Research*, 24(4), 421–468. DOI: 10.1007/s10814-016-9094-7. Open access.

Trigger, B. G. (1976). *Nubia Under the Pharaohs*. Ancient Peoples and Places 85. London: Thames and Hudson. 216 pp., 74 plates, 43 figures, 10 maps. [US edition: Boulder, CO: Westview Press.]

Wengrow, D. (2006). *The Archaeology of Early Egypt: Social Transformations in North-East Africa, 10,000 to 2650 BC*. Cambridge World Archaeology. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press. xxii+344 pp., 83 illustrations, 5 tables. ISBN 978-0-521-83586-2 (hbk) / 978-0-521-54374-3 (pbk).

Wilkinson, T. A. H. (1999). *Early Dynastic Egypt*. London and New York: Routledge. ISBN 0-415-18633-1. [Paperback reprint 2001; Taylor & Francis e-library edition 2005 — some citations give those years for the same book.]

Williams, B. (1986). *Excavations Between Abu Simbel and the Sudan Frontier, Part 1: The A-Group Royal Cemetery at Qustul, Cemetery L*. Oriental Institute Nubian Expedition III. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. ISBN 0-918986-46-X. Full scan open access: isac.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/shared/docs/oine3.pdf.

Archaeology — Levant and Eastern Mediterranean

Braun, E. (2002). Egypt's first sojourn in Canaan. In E. C. M. van den Brink & T. E. Levy (Eds.), *Egypt and the Levant* (pp. 173–189). Leicester University Press.

Braun, E. (2009). South Levantine Early Bronze Age chronological correlations with Egypt in light of the Narmer serekhs from Tel Erani and Arad: New interpretations. *British Museum Studies in Ancient Egypt and Sudan*, 13, 25–48. Open access. [Reissued 2011 in R.F. Friedman and P.N. Fiske (eds), Egypt at Its Origins 3, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 205. Leuven: Peeters, pp. 975–1001.]

Encyclopaedia Judaica. “Arad.” https://jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/judaica/ejud_0002_0002_0_01218.html.

Gophna, R. (1992). The contacts between 'En Besor oasis, southern Canaan and Egypt during the Late Predynastic and the threshold of the First Dynasty; a further assessment. In E. C. M. van den Brink (Ed.), *The Nile Delta in Transition: 4th–3rd Millennium B.C.* (pp. 385–394). Tel Aviv and Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.

Sowada, K. (2009). *Egypt in the Eastern Mediterranean during the Old Kingdom: An Archaeological Perspective*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 237. Fribourg: Academic Press / Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. xxiv + 295 pp. With a contribution by P. Grave. ISBN 978-3-7278-1649-9. DOI: 10.5167/uzh-143040 [green open access via ZORA, University of Zurich].

van den Brink, E. C. M. (1992). Preliminary report on the excavations at Tell Ibrahim Awad, seasons 1988–1990. In E. C. M. van den Brink (Ed.), *The Nile Delta in Transition* (pp. 43–68). Israel Exploration Society.

Ward, W. A. (2010). *Egypt and the East Mediterranean world 2200–1900 B.C.* American University of Beirut Press.

Archaeology — Sahara and Mauritania

Vernet, R. (1993). *Préhistoire de la Mauritanie*. Nouakchott: Centre Culturel Français A. de Saint-Exupéry / Sépia. 427 pp. ISBN 978-2-907888-25-7.

Vernet, R. (1996). *Le Sahara occidental préhistorique et ses marges: Bilan des recherches françaises*. SEDES.

Wendorf, F., & Schild, R. (2001). *Holocene Settlement of the Egyptian Sahara*. Kluwer Academic.

Climate Science and Paleoclimatology

Drake, N. A., Blench, R. M., Armitage, S. J., Bristow, C. S., & White, K. H. (2011). Ancient watercourses and biogeography of the Sahara explain the peopling of the desert. *PNAS*, 108(2), 458–462. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1012231108

Kuper, R., & Kröpelin, S. (2006). Climate-controlled Holocene occupation in the Sahara: Motor of Africa's evolution. *Science*, 313(5788), 803–807. DOI: 10.1126/science.1130989.

Comparative Mythology and Ancient Historiography

Birrell, A. (1993). *Chinese Mythology: An Introduction*, with a foreword by Yuan K’o. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press. 322 pp. ISBN 0-8018-4595-5 (hbk) / 0-8018-6183-7 (pbk).

Burstein, S.M. (1978). *The Babyloniaca of Berossus*. Sources from the Ancient Near East 1/5. Malibu: Undena Publications. [Fascicle paginated 1–37; the same text continues the series paging as SANE 1, 143–180.]

Flood, G. D. (1996). *An Introduction to Hinduism*. Cambridge University Press.

Hoffner, H. A. (1998). *Hittite Myths* (2nd ed.). Society of Biblical Literature.

Jacobsen, T. (1939). *The Sumerian King List*. Assyriological Studies 11. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Public domain; full scan on archive.org.

Kugel, J. L. (2007). *How to Read the Bible: A Guide to Scripture, Then and Now*. Free Press.

Manetho. (1940). *Manetho* (W. G. Waddell, Trans.). Loeb Classical Library, Harvard University Press.

Sima Qian. (c. 94 BCE). *Shiji (Records of the Grand Historian)*. Various editions.

Verbrugghe, G. P., & Wickersham, J. M. (1996). *Berossos and Manetho, Introduced and Translated: Native Traditions in Ancient Mesopotamia and Egypt*. University of Michigan Press.

Egyptian Religion and Iconography

Eaton, K. (2013). *Ancient Egyptian Temple Ritual: Performance, Patterns, and Practice*. Routledge Studies in Egyptology 1. London and New York: Routledge. 242 pp. ISBN 978-0-415-83298-4. [Paperback reissue 2017, ISBN 978-1-138-24309-5.]

Frankfort, H. (1978). *Kingship and the Gods: A Study of Ancient Near Eastern Religion as the Integration of Society and Nature*. Oriental Institute Essays. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. [First published 1948; the 1978 printing carries a new preface by S.N. Kramer and a different pagination.]

Hart, G. (1986). *A Dictionary of Egyptian Gods and Goddesses*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. [Second edition 2005, retitled The Routledge Dictionary of Egyptian Gods and Goddesses.]

Hendrickx, S. (2002). Bovines in Egyptian Predynastic and Early Dynastic iconography. In F. A. Hassan (Ed.), *Droughts, Food and Culture* (pp. 275–318). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum. DOI: 10.1007/0-306-47547-2_16.

Herrmann, C. (1994). Ägyptische Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 138. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag / Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Kessler, D. (1989). *Die heiligen Tiere und der König, Teil I: Beiträge zu Organisation, Kult und Theologie der spätzeitlichen Tierfriedhöfe*. Ägypten und Altes Testament 16. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. xi + 303 pp. ISBN 3-447-02863-7.

O'Connor, D. (2002). Context, function and program: Understanding ceremonial slate palettes. *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt*, 39, 5–35.

Otto, E. (1960). *Das ägyptische Mundöffnungsritual*. 2 vols. Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 3. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. [Band I: Text; Band II: Kommentar.]

Reymond (Jelínková), E.A.E. (1960). The Mythological Origin of the Egyptian Temple. PhD thesis, University of Liverpool. https://livrepository.liverpool.ac.uk/3167399/

Reymond, E. A. E. (1969). The Mythical Origin of the Egyptian Temple. Manchester: Manchester University Press. [Pages checked against the printed book: 28–29, 258–263.]

Roth, A. M. (1991). *Egyptian Phyles in the Old Kingdom: The Evolution of a System of Social Organization*. Oriental Institute.

Roth, A. M. (1992). The psš-kf and the 'Opening of the Mouth' ceremony: A ritual of birth and rebirth. Journal of Egyptian Archaeology, 78, 113–147. Roth, A. M. (1993). Fingers, stars, and the 'Opening of the Mouth': The name and function of the nṯrwj-blades. *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, 79, 57–79.

Roth, A. M. (1993). Fingers, stars, and the “Opening of the Mouth”: The nature and function of the nṯrwj-blades. Journal of Egyptian Archaeology, 79, 57–79.

Sugi, A. (2005). Offering lists in the burial chamber of the mastaba tomb of Idut. *Bulletin of the Society for Near Eastern Studies in Japan (Oriento)*, 48(1), 88–116. DOI: 10.5356/jorient.48.88. Open access.

Te Velde, H. (1990). Some remarks on the concept ‘person’ in the ancient Egyptian culture. In H. G. Kippenberg, Y. B. Kuiper & A. F. Sanders (Eds.), Concepts of Person in Religion and Thought (Religion and Reason 37, pp. 83–91). Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Tursi, G., & Genchi, F. (2024). An Udjat-eye amulet discovered at Dibbā al-Bayah (Sultanate of Oman): Long-distance trade relations in the Late Pre-Islamic burial chamber of the LCG-2 tomb. Archaeological Research in Asia, 40, 100562. DOI: 10.1016/j.ara.2024.100562. [Open access, CC BY.]

Wilkinson, R. H. (2003). *The Complete Gods and Goddesses of Ancient Egypt*. London: Thames & Hudson.

Zecchi, M. (2010). *Sobek of Shedet: The Crocodile God in the Fayyum in the Dynastic Period*. Studi sull’antico Egitto 2. Todi: Tau Editrice. 214 pp. ISBN 978-88-6244-115-5.

Egyptology — Primary Sources and Textual Editions

Allen, J. P. (2005). *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts*. Writings from the Ancient World 23. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Allen, J. P. (2006). *The Egyptian Coffin Texts, Volume 8: Middle Kingdom Copies of Pyramid Texts*. Oriental Institute Publications 132, University of Chicago.

Allen, J. P. (2015). *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts*, 2nd edition. Writings from the Ancient World 23. Atlanta: SBL Press. ISBN 978-1-62837-114-7.

Breasted, J. H. (1906). *Ancient Records of Egypt*: Historical Documents from the Earliest Times to the Persian Conquest. 5 vols. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1906–1907. [Free scans at archive.org and HathiTrust.]

Davies, N. de G. (1943). *The Tomb of Rekh-mi-Rē at Thebes* (2 vols.). Publications of the Metropolitan Museum of Art Egyptian Expedition 11. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art. [First edition limited to 300 copies; reprinted Arno Press, 1973. Available in the Metropolitan Museum of Art Digital Collection.]

de Buck, A., & Gardiner, A. (1935–1961). *The Egyptian Coffin Texts* (7 vols.). University of Chicago Press.

de Cenival, F. (1988). *Le mythe de l’œil du soleil* (Demotische Studien 9). Sommerhausen: Gisela Zauzich Verlag.

Dümichen, J. (1865). *Bauurkunde der Tempelanlagen von Dendera, in einem der geheimen Corridore im Innern der Tempelmauer aufgefunden und erläuternd mitgetheilt*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs. Open access: https://doi.org/10.11588/diglit.5932 (Universitätsbibliothek Heidelberg) and archive.org.

Farina, G. (1938). *Il papiro dei re restaurato*. Pubblicazioni Egittologiche del R. Museo di Torino. Rome. [Farina, director of the Museo Egizio 1928–1946, proposed a new placement of several fragments and gave the hieroglyphic transcription of the hieratic text with historical-chronological commentary.]

Faulkner, R. O. (1969). *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts, Translated into English*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Faulkner, R. O. (1973–1978). *The Ancient Egyptian Coffin Texts* (3 vols.). Aris & Phillips.

Faulkner, R. O. (1985). The Ancient Egyptian Book of the Dead (C. Andrews, Ed.; rev. ed.). London: British Museum Press. [First published 1972. Cited for Book of the Dead Chapters 140 and 167.]

Gardiner, A. H. (1959). *The Royal Canon of Turin*. Oxford: printed for the Griffith Institute at the University Press by Vivian Ridler. [Facsimile edition of Turin Papyrus 1874, Museo Egizio; folio, 20 pp. with 9 plates.]

Gunn, B. (1912). *The Instruction of Ptah-hotep and the Instruction of Ke'gemni*. John Murray.

Kurth, D., et al. (1998–2014). *Die Inschriften des Tempels von Edfu, Abteilung I: Übersetzungen* (Vols. 1–3). Harrassowitz.

Kurth, D., et al. (2014). *Edfou VI: Die Inschriften des Tempels von Edfu*. Harrassowitz.

Lepsius, C. R. (1849–1859). Denkmäler aus Aegypten und Aethiopien. 12 vols. Berlin: Nicolaische Buchhandlung. [Abth. III, pl. 5 carries the Tombos stela of Thutmose I, the edition used by Hertz 1931.]

Lichtheim, M. (1973). *Ancient Egyptian Literature: A Book of Readings. Volume I: The Old and Middle Kingdoms*. Near Eastern Center, UCLA. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. 245 pp. [Free scan at archive.org. Vols. II (1976) and III (1980) complete the set.]

Mariette, A. (1870–75). *Dendérah: description générale du grand temple de cette ville*. Paris. (Universitätsbibliothek Heidelberg digital edition.)

Mariette, A. (1875). *Karnak. Étude topographique et archéologique avec un appendice comprenant les principaux textes hiéroglyphiques découverts ou recueillis pendant les fouilles exécutées à Karnak* (2 vols.: Texte; Planches). Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs.

Quirke, S. (2013). Going out in Daylight – prt m hrw: The Ancient Egyptian Book of the Dead — Translation, Sources, Meanings. GHP Egyptology 20. London: Golden House Publications. xxviii + 609 pp. ISBN 978-1-906137-31-1. [The first full illustrated translation with Egyptian transliteration.]

Ryholt, K. (2004). The Turin King-list. *Ägypten und Levante*, 14, 135–155. DOI: 10.1553/AEundL14s135.

Sethe, K. (1905). *Beiträge zur ältesten Geschichte Aegyptens*. Mit einem Beitrag von Eduard Meyer. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Altertumskunde Ägyptens, Band III. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs. (Opening chapter: ‘Die Horusdiener’.)

Sethe, K. (1908–1922). *Die altägyptischen Pyramidentexte nach den Papierabdrücken und Photographien des Berliner Museums*, 4 vols. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs. [I–II text (1908, 1910); III Kritischer Apparat (1922); IV Epigraphik (1922).]

Sethe, K. (1914). *Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums IV: Urkunden der 18. Dynastie*. J. C. Hinrichs.

Wilkinson, T. A. H. (2000). *Royal Annals of Ancient Egypt: The Palermo Stone and its Associated Fragments*. Studies in Egyptology. London and New York: Kegan Paul International.

Zaba, Z. (1956). *Les maximes de Ptahhotep*. Éditions de l'Académie Tchécoslovaque des Sciences.

Epigraphy and Writing Systems

Hill, J. A. (2016). Categories of control: development of cylinder seal glyptic within the context of Egyptian state formation. In G. Graff & A. Jiménez Serrano (Eds.), Préhistoires de l'écriture (Préhistoires de la Méditerranée). Aix-en-Provence: Presses universitaires de Provence. DOI: 10.4000/books.pup.41190. [Open access on OpenEdition Books. See also Hill, J. A. (2004), Cylinder Seal Glyptic in Predynastic Egypt and Neighboring Regions, BAR International Series 1223, Oxford: Archaeopress, DOI: 10.30861/9781841715889.]

Honoré, E. (2007). Earliest cylinder-seal glyptic in Egypt: from Greater Mesopotamia to Naqada. In H. Hanna (ed.), The International Conference of Naqada and Qus Region, Monastery of the Archangel Michael, Naqada, Egypt, 22–28 January 2007: Preprints, vol. I, pp. 31–45. Cairo.

Nour El-Din, M., & Morenz, L. D. (2025). Wadi Khamila, the god Min and the beginning of "Pharaonic" dominance in Sinai 5000 years ago. *Blätter Abrahams*, 25, 75–95.

Regulski, I. (2016). The origins and early development of writing in Egypt. In *The Oxford Handbook of Topics in Archaeology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935413.013.61. [Oxford Handbooks Online; published online 2 Oct. 2014, commonly cited as 2016.]

Tallet, P. (2015). La zone minière pharaonique du Sud-Sinaï II: Les inscriptions pré- et protodynastiques du ouadi Ameyra (CCIS nos 273–335). Mémoires publiés par les membres de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale 132. Cairo: IFAO.

Tallet, P., & Laisney, D. (2012). Iry-Hor et Narmer au Sud-Sinaï (Ouadi 'Ameyra). Un complément à la chronologie des expéditions minières égyptiennes. *Bulletin de l'IFAO*, 112, 381–398. [The IFAO's own edition dates this tome to 2013; the volume is cited as both 2012 and 2013 in the literature. Free PDF at ifao.egnet.net/bifao/112/23/.]

Yale Egyptology (n.d.). The Rock Inscriptions of the Wadi Magar. Theban Desert Road Survey / Yale Toshka Desert Survey, Western Hinterland of Qamûla. https://egyptology.yale.edu/expeditions/past-and-joint-projects/theban-desert-road-survey-yale-toshka-desert-survey/qamula/wadi-magar (accessed 11 October 2026).

Genetics and Population Genomics

De Martino, M., De Cupere, B., et al. (2025). The dispersal of domestic cats from North Africa to Europe around 2000 years ago. *Science*, 390(6776), eadt2642. DOI: 10.1126/science.adt2642

Dominy, N. J., et al. (2020). Mummified baboons reveal the far reach of early Egyptian mariners. *eLife*, 9, e60860. DOI: 10.7554/eLife.60860

Keita, S. O. Y., & Boyce, A. J. (2005). Genetics, Egypt, and history: Interpreting geographical patterns of Y chromosome variation. *History in Africa*, 32, 221–246. DOI: 10.1353/hia.2005.0013.

Lipson, M., Ringbauer, H., Reich, D., et al. (2025). High continuity of forager ancestry in the Neolithic period of the eastern Maghreb. *Nature*, 641(8064), 925–931. DOI: 10.1038/s41586-025-08699-4

Morez Jacobs, A., et al. (2025). Whole-genome ancestry of an Old Kingdom Egyptian. *Nature*, 644(8077), 714–721. DOI: 10.1038/s41586-025-09195-5.

Ringbauer, H., et al. (2025). Punic people were genetically diverse with almost no Levantine ancestors. *Nature*, 643(8070), 139–147. DOI: 10.1038/s41586-025-08913-3

Salem, N., et al. (2025). Ancient DNA from the Green Sahara reveals ancestral North African lineage. *Nature*, 641(8061), 144–150. DOI: 10.1038/s41586-025-08793-7.

van de Loosdrecht, M., et al. (2018). Pleistocene North African genomes link Near Eastern and sub-Saharan African human populations. *Science*, 360(6388), 548–552.

Geology and Geochemistry

Abdeina, E. H., et al. (2024). How old is the Eye of Africa? A polyphase history for the igneous Richat Structure, Mauritania. *Lithos*, 107698.

El Afandy, A. H., El Nahas, H. A., Dawood, N. A., & Asran, H. M. (2013). Geochemistry, mineralogy, and radioactivity of Upper Cretaceous Abu Khruq Ring Complex, South Eastern Desert, Egypt. Arabian Journal of Geosciences, 6(2), 855–871.

Giresse, P., Sao, O., & de Lumley, H. (2012). Étude paléoenvironnementale des sédiments quaternaires du Guelb er Richât (Adrar de Mauritanie) en regard des sites voisins ou associés du Paléolithique inférieur. Discussion et perspectives. L'Anthropologie, 116(1), 12–38. [English subtitle: Palaeoenvironmental study of Quaternary sediments of Guelb er Richât (Adrar of Mauritania) compared to sites nearby or associated with Early Palaeolithic.]

Harrell, J. A., & Storemyr, P. (2009). Ancient Egyptian quarries: An illustrated overview. In N. Abu-Jaber, E. G. Bloxam, P. Degryse & T. Heldal (Eds.), *QuarryScapes: Ancient Stone Quarry Landscapes in the Eastern Mediterranean*(Geological Survey of Norway Special Publication 12, pp. 7–50). Trondheim: Geological Survey of Norway. [Free PDF from ngu.no.]

Matton, G. & Jébrak, M. (2014). The "eye of Africa" (Richat dome, Mauritania): An isolated Cretaceous alkaline-hydrothermal complex. Journal of African Earth Sciences, 97, 109–124. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jafrearsci.2014.04.006

Obeid, M. A., & Lalonde, A. E. (2013). The geochemistry and petrogenesis of the Late Cretaceous Abu Khuruq alkaline complex, Eastern Desert, Egypt. *The Canadian Mineralogist*, 51(4), 537–558. DOI: 10.3749/canmin.51.4.537.

Sao, O., Giresse, P., de Lumley, H., Faure, O., Perrenoud, C., Saos, T., Rachid, M.O. & Touré, O.C. (2008). The sedimentary environments of the pre-Acheulean and Acheulean deposits of the Akerdil and Bamouéré wadis (Guelb er-Richât, Adrar, Mauritania), a first approach. L'Anthropologie, 112(1), 1–14.

Sedigh, M.E., Ouali, H., Jébrak, M. & Mokhtari, A. (2024). Bulk composition and O–C isotope constraints on the petrogenesis of Richat carbonatites (Mauritania). Journal of African Earth Sciences, 209, 105126. DOI: 10.1016/j.jafrearsci.2023.105126.

Taylor, C.D. & Giles, S.A. (2015). Mineral potential for incompatible element deposits hosted in pegmatites, alkaline rocks, and carbonatites in the Islamic Republic of Mauritania (phase V, deliverable 87). In Second Projet de Renforcement Institutionnel du Secteur Minier de la République Islamique de Mauritanie (PRISM-II). U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2013-1280-Q, 41 p. https://doi.org/10.3133/ofr20131280Q

Linguistics and Historical Linguistics

Kammerzell, F. (2013). Old Egyptian and Pre-Old Egyptian: Tracing linguistic diversity in Archaic Egypt and the creation of the Egyptian language. In S. J. Seidlmayer (Ed.), *Texte und Denkmäler des ägyptischen Alten Reiches* (Thesaurus Linguae Aegyptiae 3, pp. 165–247). Berlin: Achet. [Kammerzell's own Humboldt bibliography and the UCLA Encyclopedia of Egyptology date the volume 2005; Glottolog dates it 2013.]

Rilly, C. (2016). The Wadi Howar Diaspora and its role in the spread of East Sudanic languages from the fourth to the first millennium BCE. *Faits de Langues*, 47(1), 151–163. DOI: 10.1163/19589514-047-01-900000010

Material Culture Studies — Stone Vessels

Aston, B. G. (1994). *Ancient Egyptian Stone Vessels: Materials and Forms*. Studien zur Archäologie und Geschichte Altägyptens 5. Heidelberg: Heidelberger Orientverlag. 196 pp. ISBN 978-3-927552-12-8. [Originally a PhD dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1989.]

Mallory-Greenough, L. M., Greenough, J. D., & Owen, J. V. (1999). The stone source of Predynastic basalt vessels: Mineralogical evidence for quarries in Northern Egypt. *Journal of Archaeological Science*, 26(10), 1261–1272.

Mathematics and Metrology

Clagett, M. (1999). *Ancient Egyptian Science: A Source Book. Volume 3: Ancient Egyptian Mathematics*. Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society 232. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.

Gillings, R. J. (1972). *Mathematics in the Time of the Pharaohs*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. [Reprinted New York: Dover Publications, 1982; page references in the literature are commonly to the Dover reprint.]

Pommerening, T. (2003). *Die altägyptischen Hohlmaße*. Helmut Buske Verlag.

Ritter, J. (2002). Closing the eye of Horus: The rise and fall of 'Horus-eye' fractions. In J. M. Steele & A. Imhausen (Eds.), *Under One Sky* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 297, pp. 297–323). Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

Museum and Curatorial Studies

Goddio, F., & Clauss, M. (Eds.) (2006). *Egypt's Sunken Treasures*. Munich: Prestel. 464 pp. ISBN 978-3-7913-3545-2. [Exhibition catalogue, photographs by C. Gerigk; 2nd edition 2008.]

Petrie Museum of Egyptian Archaeology, UCL. UC36981: mud sealing fragment with royal necropolis seal impression (Khentiamentiu, Narmer, Hor-Aha, Djer, Djet, Den, Merytneith), Abydos, Umm el-Qa'ab, 1st Dynasty. https://collections.ucl.ac.uk/Details/collect/1115

Taylor, J. H., & Antoine, D. (2014). Ancient Lives, New Discoveries: Eight Mummies, Eight Stories. London: British Museum Press. [Gebelein mummies at pp. 22–43.]

Paleohydrology and Geomorphology

Klokočník, J., Kostelecký, J., Cílek, V., Bezděk, A. & Pešek, I. (2017). A support for the existence of paleolakes and paleorivers buried under Saharan sand by means of "gravitational signal" from EIGEN 6C4. *Arabian Journal of Geosciences*, 10, 199. DOI: 10.1007/s12517-017-2962-8

Paillou, P., Schuster, M., Tooth, S., Farr, T., Rosenqvist, A., Lopez, S. & Malézieux, J.-M. (2009). Mapping of a major paleodrainage system in eastern Libya using orbital imaging radar: The Kufrah River. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 277(3–4), 327–333. DOI: 10.1016/j.epsl.2008.10.029

Paillou, P., Tooth, S. & Lopez, S. (2012). The Kufrah paleodrainage system in Libya: A past connection to the Mediterranean Sea? *Comptes Rendus Géoscience*, 344(8), 406–414. DOI: 10.1016/j.crte.2012.07.002

Papyrology and Manuscript Studies

O'Connell, E. R., et al. (2022). The Hay Archive of Coptic spells on leather: A multidisciplinary study. *British Museum Studies in Ancient Egypt and Sudan*, 27, 1–45.

Schott, S. (1963). Die Opferliste als Schrift des Thoth. *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde*, 90, 103–110.

Schott, S. (1990). *Bücher und Bibliotheken im alten Ägypten: Verzeichnis der Buch- und Spruchtitel und der Termini technici*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Sherbiny, W. (2017b). The so-called Book of Two Ways on a Middle Kingdom religious leather roll. In M. Guidotti & G. Rosati (Eds.), *Proceedings of the XI International Congress of Egyptologists, Florence, 23–30 August 2015* (pp. 590–592). Oxford: Archaeopress.

Sherbiny, W. (2018). Echoes of a lost legacy: The recent research on the so-called Book of Two Ways in ancient Egypt. *Shodoznavstvo / The Oriental Studies*, 81, 44–57. Open access (A.Yu. Krymskyi Institute of Oriental Studies, NAS of Ukraine).

Physical Anthropology and Bioarchaeology

Ascenzi, A. (1980). The infant mummy of Uan Muhuggiag. In A. Cockburn & E. Cockburn (Eds.), Mummies, Disease and Ancient Cultures (pp. 224–226). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [Chapter 13, 'Miscellaneous mummies'. A revised account appears in the 2nd edition: Ascenzi, A. & Bianco, P. (1998), in A. Cockburn, E. Cockburn & T. A. Reyman (Eds.), pp. 263–266 and 281–283.]

Capasso, G., Sperduti, A., Ahmed, H. I., Cipriani, A., Bondioli, L., Nava, A., Lugli, F., & Manzo, A. (2026). Oscillating diachronic mobility patterns in prehistoric Eastern Sudan revealed by 87Sr/86Sr isotope analysis. Scientific Reports, 16, 8800. DOI: 10.1038/s41598-026-37691-9.

di Lernia, S., Cremaschi, M., & Manzi, G. (2008). Natural mummification of prehistoric human remains in the Libyan Sahara. *Journal of Archaeological Science*, 35(8), 2101–2109.

Friedman, R., Antoine, D., Talamo, S., Reimer, P. J., Taylor, J. H., Wills, B., & Mannino, M. A. (2018). Natural mummies from Predynastic Egypt reveal the world's earliest figural tattoos. *Journal of Archaeological Science*, 92, 116–125. DOI: 10.1016/j.jas.2018.02.002.

Giuffra, V., et al. (2010). The Uan Muhuggiag child mummy revisited by radiological and pathological investigation. *HOMO*, 61(4), 273–288.

Jones, J., Higham, T. F. G., Chivall, D., Bianucci, R., Kay, G. L., Pallen, M. J., Oldfield, R., Ugliano, F., & Buckley, S. A. (2018). A prehistoric Egyptian mummy: Evidence for an 'embalming recipe' and the evolution of early formative funerary treatments. *Journal of Archaeological Science*, 100, 191–200. DOI: 10.1016/j.jas.2018.07.011. [Open access, CC BY-NC-ND.]

Mori, F., & Ascenzi, A. (1959). La mummia infantile di Uan Muhuggiag: Osservazioni antropologiche. *Rivista di Antropologia*, 46, 125–148.

Prowse, T. L., & Lovell, N. C. (1996). Concordance of cranial and dental morphological traits and evidence for endogamy in ancient Egypt. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 101(2), 237–246. DOI: 10.1002/(SICI)1096-8644(199610)101:2<237::AID-AJPA8>3.0.CO;2-Z. PMID: 8893087.

Zakrzewski, S. R. (2007). Population continuity or population change: Formation of the ancient Egyptian state. American Journal of Physical Anthropology, 132(4), 501–509. DOI: 10.1002/ajpa.20569.

Zakrzewski, S. R., & Powell, J. (2011). Cranial variability and population diversity at Hierakonpolis. In R. F. Friedman & P. N. Fiske (Eds.), Egypt at its Origins 3, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 205 (pp. 333–346). Leuven: Peeters. ISBN 978-90-429-2490-1. Zakrzewski, S. R. (2007). Population continuity or population change: Formation of the ancient Egyptian state. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 132(4), 501–509.

Radiocarbon Dating and Chronometrics

Dee, M., et al. (2013). An absolute chronology for early Egypt using radiocarbon dating and Bayesian statistical modelling. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A*, 469(2159), 20130395.

Remote Sensing and Satellite Archaeology

Aziz, A. M., Friedman, R., & Attia, T. (2026). Unveiling hidden prehistoric structure via high-resolution GPR survey at Hierakonpolis, Aswan, Egypt. Scientific Reports, 16, 22413. DOI: 10.1038/s41598-026-58177-8.

Rock Art Studies

Le Quellec, J.-L. (2011). Rock art research in Africa. In T. Insoll (Ed.), *Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of Ritual and Religion* (Oxford Handbooks in Archaeology, pp. 664–678). Oxford: Oxford University Press. ISBN 978-0-19-923244-4. [Volume verified: Insoll (ed.), 1108 pp., 2011. NOTE: Le Quellec also contributed 'The Rock Art of Sub-Saharan Africa' to the separate Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology and Anthropology of Rock Art; the two should not be conflated.]

Le Quellec, J.-L. (2013). Périodisation et chronologie des images rupestres du Sahara central. Préhistoires Méditerranéennes, 4. Association pour la promotion de la préhistoire et de l'anthropologie méditerranéennes. ISSN 2105-2565. Open access: journals.openedition.org/pm/715

Lutz, R., & Lutz, G. (1995). *The Secret of the Desert: The Rock Art of the Messak Settafet and Messak Mellet, Libya*. Innsbruck: Golf.

Zooarchaeology

Bouché, P., Doamba, B., Sissoko, B. & Bouju, S. (2009). Les éléphants du Gourma, Mali : statut et menaces pour leur conservation. Pachyderm 45 (July 2008–June 2009): 47–56.

Gautier, A. & Van Neer, W. (2009). Animal remains from predynastic sites in the Nagada region, Middle Egypt. *Archaeofauna*, 18, 27–50.

Linseele, V., & Van Neer, W. (2009). Exploitation of desert and other wild game in ancient Egypt: The archaeozoological evidence from the Nile Valley. In H. Riemer, F. Förster, M. Herb & N. Pöllath (Eds.), *Desert Animals in the Eastern Sahara: Status, Economic Significance, and Cultural Reflection in Antiquity* (pp. 47–78). Colloquium Africanum 4. Köln: Heinrich-Barth-Institut.

Pöllath, N. (2009). The prehistoric gamebag: The archaeozoological record from sites in the Western Desert of Egypt. In H. Riemer, F. Förster, M. Herb & N. Pöllath (Eds.), *Desert Animals in the Eastern Sahara: Status, Economic Significance, and Cultural Reflection in Antiquity* (pp. 79–110). Colloquium Africanum 4. Köln: Heinrich-Barth-Institut.

Rossel, S., et al. (2008). Domestication of the donkey: Timing, processes, and indicators. *PNAS*, 105(10), 3715–3720. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.0709692105

Van Neer, W., De Cupere, B., & Friedman, R. (2024). The earliest evidence for deformation of livestock horns: The case of Predynastic sheep from Hierakonpolis, Egypt. *Journal of Archaeological Science*, 172, 106104. DOI: 10.1016/j.jas.2024.106104

Van Neer, W., De Cupere, B., & Friedman, R. F. (2026). New archaeozoological analysis of baboons buried at Hierakonpolis (Upper Egypt) shows two species were imported in the Predynastic period. *Archaeological and Anthropological Sciences*, 18(3), 62. DOI: 10.1007/s12520-026-02416-6

Van Neer, W., Linseele, V., & Friedman, R. F. (2004). Animal burials and food offerings at the elite cemetery HK6 of Hierakonpolis. In S. Hendrickx, R. F. Friedman, K. M. Ciałowicz & M. Chłodnicki (Eds.), *Egypt at its Origins*: Studies in Memory of Barbara Adams (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 138, pp. 67–130). Leuven: Peeters.

Van Neer, W., Linseele, V., Friedman, R. F., & De Cupere, B. (2014). More evidence for cat taming at the Predynastic elite cemetery of Hierakonpolis (Upper Egypt). *Journal of Archaeological Science*, 45, 103–111. DOI: 10.1016/j.jas.2014.02.014

Van Neer, W., Udrescu, M., Linseele, V., De Cupere, B., & Friedman, R. (2015). Traumatism in the wild animals kept and offered at Predynastic Hierakonpolis, Upper Egypt. International Journal of Osteoarchaeology, 27, 86–105. DOI: 10.1002/oa.2440.

Zep Tepi Series (Self-Citation)

Levy, S. (2026a). The Eye of the Sahara Hypothesis: A Predictive Model and 25-Element Testing Protocol for Predynastic Saharan Migration (Zep Tepi Series, Paper I). Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18472416

Levy, S. (2026b). Zep Tepi — People of the First Time (Zep Tepi Series, Paper II). Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19046277

Levy, S. (2026c). *The Shemsu Hor Hypothesis: A Continuation: What Egypt Remembered (Zep Tepi Series, Paper III)*. Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19449606

Artificial Intelligence Use Disclosure

AI language models were used during the development process in a supporting capacity:

Claude (Anthropic) — Primary research partner and analytical reviewer. Used for structural argument testing, source verification, and document editing. The specific constraint requiring any critique of the paper's argument to be accompanied by an equally rigorous alternative explanation was developed in dialogue with this model.

ChatGPT (GPT-4o, OpenAI) — External reviewer and adversarial framework testing. Used to stress-test the structural argument and identify logical weaknesses.

Perplexity AI — Specialist fact-checking, including the Souls of Pe/Nekhen connection and the Nuwayrat aDNA framing.

Gemini (Google) — Source verification and philological cross-checking, including transliteration verification and Coffin Text exclusion validation.

Grok (xAI) — Mathematical verification, including the geometric calculations in Section 1 (corridor fractions and Richat geometry, verified against Abdeina et al. 2024).

No AI generated the underlying argument, sourced original evidence, or authored interpretive claims. All cited evidence derives from published, peer-reviewed sources. The analytical framework, editorial judgments, and conclusions are the author's own.